

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1881.

The Week.

THE coming of the new year has been marked in this city by a distinct improvement in the newspaper reflections suggested by the occasion—which are apt to be almost maudlin in their pathos—and by the distinct decline, and indeed in what is called “good society,” one may say, the extinction, of the visiting custom. Most ladies now close their doors altogether; some are at home to gentlemen to whom they send cards. In fact, the thing has been pronounced vulgar, and will in another year have got down wholly among “the boys.” Various agencies have contributed to this result. The city has grown too large to make many visits possible, and the circle of most ladies’ acquaintance too large to make receiving agreeable. Then the custom had begun to have very coarse associations; every kitchen had its visitors, who staggered from basement to basement in grotesque imitation of the doings in the parlor, and “the boys” and the politicians seized on it as an occasion for drowning their sorrows or celebrating their victories in sweet champagne and new whiskey. In fact, the old Dutch simplicity and domesticity had departed from it with remarkable completeness, and it is well that its objectionableness should be at last formally recognized. It served many good purposes in its day. It enabled busy men to visit one day in the year women whom on no other day in the year they were sure of finding at home, and to renew acquaintanceships or friendships which were otherwise in danger of perishing through simple failure to meet. It afforded an opportunity, too, for putting an end to coolness or estrangement without the formality of reconciliation or explanation.

The old year closed in Wall Street on an active money market, but with the banks stronger by more than \$2,000,000 than the year before; on a foreign-exchange market scarcely, although nearly, warranting gold imports; and on very high markets for railroad securities classed as investments, as well as those which are subject to speculation. The new year opened very much as the old had closed, but before the first day had passed there was a rush to sell out speculative holdings to January investors, and the result was a sudden drop of three to eight points in the stocks which have advanced the most in the last six weeks. Since this break there has been a “feverish” market in place of the January “boom” so generally expected. There are excellent reasons for high prices for undoubtedly good securities, and among these are (1) the prospect of a lowering of the rate of interest on United States bonds, which are considered as the standard investment; (2) the large business of the railroads; (3) the generally prosperous condition of the country; and (4) the large additions to the currency by foreign-specie imports and the product of our mines. And yet prices at the Stock Exchange, as a rule, are very high, and it is a question whether the reasons given even warrant as high figures as those current.

The affairs of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company have received special attention during the week on both sides of the Atlantic. When Mr. Gowen became the president and practical manager of the company its business was merely that of a carrier; this business was very profitable, and the credit of the company was very high. He conceived the notion of extending the operations of the company to mining coal, and to consuming it in the making of iron. To do this enlarged business the credit of the company was strained to its utmost, and its debt and obligations enormously increased. The result was the usual one, and in time the stockholders awoke to the fact that Mr. Gowen, while a brilliant man in some respects, lacked the qualities necessary for the wise and prudent management of a great corporation. So fertile was Mr. Gowen in expedients, and so plausible in recommending them has he been, that even now, when the company is in the hands of receivers who represent in a measure the large debt which was created as part of his policy, he has a following in his efforts to be

elected president. The day appointed for the election is the 10th inst. Mr. Gowen went to London a few weeks ago in order, it is understood, to obtain the proxies of the McCalmont Bros., the largest single holders of the stock. They declined to give them to him, and he is now moving heaven and earth to postpone the election. A dinner was given to him recently in London by Mr. Puleston, at present a member of Parliament, but formerly from Pennsylvania, of which State he was agent during the war when Andrew Curtin was governor. The dinner was merely a social affair, although an attempt is made to put another construction on it. Unless Mr. Gowen can indefinitely postpone the election, it is likely that he will be defeated. There are 685,000 shares of the stock of the par value of \$50. Of this amount 186,000 have not been registered for three months and accordingly cannot vote; probably 50,000 to 100,000 more shares are floating about among stock-brokers which are not qualified for voting. Messrs. Kidder, Peabody & Co., who in this matter represent the McCalmonts and other English shareholders, have proxies for 215,000 shares duly registered; and, as we have said, if the election cannot be deferred, Mr. Gowen will probably be ousted, leaving behind him a record which, so far as corporate management is concerned, is a monument of incapacity.

The contest at Albany over the Senator to succeed Mr. Kernan really began in the contest for the Speakership of the Assembly, the Conklingite Machine being represented by General Sharpe and the “Anti-Machine” by Mr. Skinner. For some time great things were told of Mr. Skinner’s chances of the nomination by the Republican caucus, and a paragraph in double-leaded type in the *Tribune*, purporting to be authoritative, announced substantially that President Garfield would see that those who opposed the Machine should not suffer for it. In spite of all this, however, Mr. Skinner found it prudent to withdraw on Monday without going to a vote, having discovered that his backing would, in the presence of General Sharpe’s evidently superior strength, be small, owing to the desire of many of his followers not to be left out in the cold when the committees came to be named. Opinions seem to be divided as to whether this decides the Senatorship question or not. The Skinnerites say not; that they have only retreated in order to jump better, and that the support which was wanting when the Speakership was at stake will be forthcoming after the formation of the committees. Mr. Conkling has not yet named his man, but he will probably now do so. The anti-Machinists tend to settle on Mr. Chauncey Depew. Rumors are, of course, plentiful enough, and they are of every degree of probability and improbability. Nothing we have seen, however, equals in simplicity and dryness the Boston *Advertiser’s* reason for thinking that Mr. Conkling is taking no part in the conflict. It is that “the demands on a Senator, in the line of his public duties, are very great, and leave him little time for running the politics of the towns and villages represented in the Legislature.” Even if the writer of this be very young, his youth will not explain it. He ought, as Charles Lamb proposed in the case of the man who expressed a high opinion of Shakspeare’s writings, to have his “bumps” examined with the aid of a sperm candle.

The conflict, of course, excites much angry feeling and tends to embitter sentiments. The announcement of the *Tribune*, appearing to indicate that it had got the “organship” of the new Administration, seemed to rouse in the *Times* the worst passions of our nature, and when Mr. Reid, the editor of the *Tribune*, went up to Albany in the character of a “practical man,” to lobby for Skinner, the *Times* threw aside all restraint, called his performances the “antics” of a “ridiculous coxcomb,” and wrote a terrible burlesque on the semi-official announcement. We must say that it seems very imprudent for Mr. Garfield to appoint an organ so soon; next May would have been time enough, when the *Times* was more fully committed to the support of his administration, and the troublesome cabinet question was out of the way.

A “Democratic Assemblyman” at Albany has indirectly given the correspondent of the *Herald* a definition of “personal magnetism”—a

thing much talked of in politics, but seldom or never described. He said that in the contest for the Speakership Sharpe would win "because he had more personal magnetism than Skinner," and he explained this by adding that Sharpe is "one of those men who will go round and drink with the boys, while Skinner is all for temperance." There is so much personal magnetism now amongst local politicians that it is a pity it cannot be turned to account, like other forms of electricity, in lighting country towns. Many a statesman's "home" might be kept light as day every night for the cost of his board, if he would consent to let his magnetism be drawn upon for the public use, instead of wasting it in bar-rooms on "the boys."

In Wisconsin it is not a question, as in New York, of the Boss's man, but of the Boss himself, viz., E. W. Keyes, the postmaster of Madison since 1861. This notorious political manager, now seeking the senatorship, became chairman of the Republican State Committee some twelve years ago and held the position up to the date of President Hayes's Executive Order. In that period the party incurred a signal defeat, for the first time since 1852, and was barely able to regain its control of the State in the year following a corrupt Democratic administration. Since his retirement the party majority has risen to 30,000. As ex-Senator Howe puts it, both before and after Keyes's chairmanship "Republican majorities have been much larger and much cheaper." His predecessor, Mr. Rublee, late Minister to Switzerland, "rarely used," says another authority, "more than \$2,000 in a campaign, while Mr. Keyes had from \$11,000 to \$30,000. In 1876 the National Committee sent him \$15,000 in one lump." Mr. Howe credits him with having had "a larger agency in manipulating our legislatures and conventions than any man who now lives or did live in the State," and this seems to be his warrant for appealing to the gratitude of his party. In spite of the decline of the party under his rule, it is by no means certain that he will not succeed. His chief antagonist is Mr. Philetus Sawyer, a wealthy lumberman, formerly a representative in Congress. A movement in favor of President Chapin, of Beloit College, would seem to have little chance between two such conflicting interests. Keyes, by the way, who is almost universally disliked, especially by the better portion of the community, is a good example of the effect on a man of holding an office as his own property and for his private ends. His tenure, which has now lasted for twenty years solely because of his political importance, is a perfectly legitimate result of the present system, which is shown, therefore, neither to shorten the term of office in accordance with Mr. Fenton's views on rotation, nor to produce sweetness of manners.

In Maine, too, a college president, not unfamiliar with political life, has been talked of as Mr. Blaine's colleague. General Chamberlain has written a very dignified letter in reply to some of his would-be supporters, not refusing the candidacy, but declining to put himself forward. Here again we must not hope, in a State boss-ridden for so many years, for the popular endorsement of a "literary feller," and there can be little doubt that the lot will fall either to Mr. Eugene Hale or Mr. W. P. Frye. One could not ask for better evidence of the demoralization caused by Senatorial dictatorship in State politics. Neither the intellectual weight of either candidate, nor the arts by which he has maintained himself for so many years in Congress, are such as to make the spectacle of their contesting a seat in the United States Senate anything but distressing. In Pennsylvania the conflict rages between an old war-horse, Galusha A. Grow, and Mr. Henry W. Oliver, jr., and is not very inspiring. Mr. Dawes seems sure to be returned again from Massachusetts; Connecticut will promote General Hawley from the lower to the upper House; Mr. Sherman has no longer any misgivings in Ohio; and General Harrison has at least the best chance in Indiana. In Minnesota the opposing candidates are the present Secretary of War, Ramsey, and the present Senator, McMillan.

Mr. Cooper went out of office with the old year amid circumstances suggestive of the "old days" of city politics rather than of the close of a reform Mayor's term. In short, he indulged in the practice of "midnight appointments," which the merest tyro in such matters knows to be characteristic of a wholly unreformed appointing power. The only hypothesis consistent with reform upon which he could have proceeded

is that his successor is an unusually bad man, unworthy of confidence, and likely to abuse to the utmost extent any privileges inadvertently left him. This may be sound as to Mr. Grace specifically, but as a working hypothesis for the use of outgoing mayors it has the disadvantage of being open to misconception. It would be simply impossible for Mr. Cooper to persuade a large number of his constituents that, in his anxiety to use the last remaining moments of his term in receiving resignations and appointing new officials, he had not an eye to the interests of the "Cooper Democrats." The Cooper Democrats may be so much superior as public servants to the Grace Democrats that it is important to resort to all the old practices of Tweed Democrats, and recall to a disinterested observer the days of Fisk and Barnard, in order to instal the former and oust the latter; but these distinctions are not only transitory but, to an inexperienced eye, infinitesimal. Neither of these truths has been recognized by Mr. Cooper during his career as a reform mayor, but nevertheless we suspect it was a surprise to many of his supporters to find his exit marked by all the phenomena of municipal intrigue. The whole affair, by the way, takes on an appearance of mystery in the unexplained resignation of a public office by Mr. Andrew H. Green and the appointment in his stead of Mr. Charles F. MacLean, who it is both maintained and denied is Mr. Tilden's nephew. Mr. Green's retirement from the Park Commission puzzles people, because we believe there is no authentic account of his ever having resigned an office before.

Whittaker, the colored cadet, having persisted in his demand for a court-martial, to which, after the finding of the Court of Enquiry, he is fairly entitled, the President has ordered one, and it is to meet here. In order to satisfy the public prejudice about the hostility to him of the West Point officers, the majority of the members will be officers who have entered the army from civil life—General Miles presiding. Mr. Emory Storrs, the Republican campaign orator; Mr. D. H. Brewster, and ex-Governor Chamberlain, of South Carolina, are to defend Whittaker. We believe there is no pretence that he has any fresh evidence in store. He simply expects the old evidence to produce a different effect on new minds. A Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati *Commercial* does, however, hint that "Whittaker's friends" intend to endeavor to prove that the "mutilation" and tying up were not done by the cadets, but by "some other persons of higher rank." This, if true, shows that Whittaker is even more enterprising than we thought him. If he is going to accuse "persons of higher rank," our advice to him, by all means, would be to make a clean job of it and put it all on General Schofield. It would be just like the man who wrote the late letter on enforcing social equality by military discipline to be up nights cutting the ears and hair of poor negro boys, and cunningly hitting them on the scalp with Indian clubs and on the nose with looking-glasses, without leaving any mark.

General Sherman has recently delivered himself to somewhat the same effect as General Schofield on the inexpediency of selecting West Point as a place in which to enforce social equality between blacks and whites. The Government has no right to make a scientific institution a field for any such experiment, and we should join with the enemies of the school in desiring its abolition rather than its conversion to any such use, even if military discipline were not a ridiculous instrument for the production of social equality. Apropos of what we said recently touching the wide-spread desire to have other people's sons associate with colored boys, there is a very good, and we believe strictly true, story in the November number of the *International Review*, in an article on the Whittaker case, by Professor Andrews, of the Military Academy. When the colored cadets first made their appearance there a white gentleman came to place his son at the school, and expressed great gratification at hearing that the colored boys were coming in. This was very welcome to the officers, as it promised them ready relief from a new difficulty, so they proposed that his son should chum with a colored cadet. He promptly refused to permit anything of the kind.

The Supreme Court has made a new decision in the much litigated case of *Williams vs. Bruffy*. The facts in question are very simple. Before the war Bruffy, a Virginian, owed some money to Williams, a citizen

of Pennsylvania, and this debt or credit was confiscated by the Confederate Government, which compelled the debtor to pay an equivalent amount into the Confederate Treasury. After the war Williams sued Bruffy in a Virginia court, which held the payment under the Confiscation Act to be a good defence, and decided the case for Bruffy. An appeal to the Virginia Court of Appeals was refused, and the case was therefore taken to the Supreme Court at Washington. The decision of the Virginia Court was then reversed, and it was decided that the payment under the Confiscation Act was a mere nullity. The Virginia Court of Appeals was directed to allow an appeal. This the judges refused to do, partly on the ground that the Virginia statutory limit of two years for the allowance of appeals had expired. An application was thereupon again made to the Supreme Court at Washington to make its judgment effectual, and on this it now holds that it may pass over the Virginia Court of last resort altogether and award judgment directly against Bruffy for the amount of the debt. This decision is believed in Virginia to have an important bearing upon the debt question. The present judges of the Court of Appeals are understood to be staunchly opposed to repudiation, and the object of the anti-debt-paying party has been to turn them out and put in a bench of repudiators. But if the Supreme Court can disregard the action of the Court of Appeals in any bond cases that may come before it, any time spent in changing the complexion of that court will be entirely thrown away.

One almost forgives Mrs. Swisshelm for her recent diatribe against Eastern philanthropy, as manifested toward the Indians, when one reads the denunciations of Secretary Schurz by Governor Long and his Boston fellow-citizens on behalf of the Poncas. The fact that the Secretary himself was among the first to make public the wrong done to this tribe by the treaty of the previous Administration, conveying their Dakota reservation to the Sioux, his prompt dealing with discovered rascality in the Indian service, and, above all, his character for probity and humanity, do not hinder a great number of good men and women and sundry journalists at the East from charging him with duplicity worthy of the Indian Ring. A delegation of Poncas has voluntarily come to Washington to confirm the possession of the present reservation in the Indian Territory, and to obtain, if possible, from Congress indemnification for the tribe's material losses in abandoning Dakota. Mr. Schurz is accused of having deterred them by threats from speaking their mind freely; of having subjected them to espionage and made them inaccessible to representatives of the seceding body, who escaped to the old northern home and have recommenced the settlement there; and of having garbled a letter expressing their willingness to sell their Dakota lands, thus furnishing Congress a basis for making amends to them. These imputations proceed from an officious person named Tibbles, who cannot be reconciled to the thought that any of the Poncas should be willing to stay where they are, and who is the chief authority for stories of suffering and oppression which are known to have been greatly exaggerated, if not intentional falsifications. Eastern humanity, however, refuses to be satisfied, and the President has despatched a commission of two Bostonians and two army officers, Generals Crook and Miles, to the new seat of the tribe, whose report will doubtless settle the dispute over their prosperity and contentedness.

The South African Boers are finding friends among their Dutch cousins at home. Professor Hartig, of the University of Utrecht, in Holland, has drawn up an address to the British nation, which has received a large number of influential signatures, praying for the restoration of the independence of the Transvaal Republic. It is a strong, solemn, and in some parts impassioned protest against the annexation. It dwells strongly on the fact, which probably constitutes the greatest difficulty Mr. Gladstone has in dealing with the question, that the annexation was denounced vigorously by nearly every member of the present Cabinet as one of the crimes of the Beaconsfield Ministry, inasmuch as it had no shadow of moral justification. The Boers never for one moment acquiesced in it. They met in December, 1879, to the number of six thousand three hundred, and refused to accept the annexation, and declared their unalterable determination to seek the restoration of their independence. After trying peaceful means for one year they have attacked the British posts in their territory

with success, and now seem to hold nearly all the principal places, and strong reinforcements are moving out against them. If the "honor of the flag" had not now to be vindicated, the appeal of the Boers would probably produce a good deal of effect; but even Mr. Gladstone, who is probably more of a moralist than any other prominent politician of the day, will hardly resist the old demand for vengeance. His acceptance of all the doings of the Tories in South Africa while repudiating them in Afghanistan is thus far the least defensible feature in his policy. The Boers will be easily enough overcome as long as they present themselves in armed masses, but to hold their country after they disperse to their homes, in the teeth of their hostility, will be a difficult and painful task.

The plan of arbitration between Turkey and Greece seems to have broken down completely, owing to the refusal of the Greeks to listen to it. M. Tricoupis, the late Minister, but now the leader of the Opposition, drew from M. Coumoundouros in the Chamber at Athens, on Friday last, an explicit declaration that under no circumstances would Greece accept anything short of the award of the Berlin Conference, and a bill was passed authorizing the Ministry to obtain an immediate advance of \$5,000,000 on the proposed loan of \$24,000,000. The Greeks have now 80,000 men under arms; they expect to have 100,000 by spring, and the troops are said to be making excellent progress in drill and discipline, and are much better officered in the lower grades than the Turks. Moreover, they rely on the support of seven-eighths of the inhabitants of the region they propose to annex. They are also reported to be landing arms in some of the Turkish islands, and, in fact, to be doing what they can to promote a Pan-Hellenic rising. Even if their chances seemed worse than they do, it would now be too late to go back, as everybody familiar with the state of popular feeling acknowledges that the King's Government could not survive failure to fight in the spring. There are too many men of a small population under arms to make a retreat anything but an unbearable humiliation to one of the vainest peoples in the world. The Turks are making their preparations, too, but of course under enormous difficulties of every kind. If they are not allowed to use their iron-clads against the Greek ports, or to convey troops and stores to the Gulf of Volo, it will go hard with them, and both of these things Mr. Gladstone can, if he pleases, forbid. As to the probable attitude of the Powers in case the Greeks go on, Sir Charles Dilke has positively affirmed in a recent speech that both France, Austria, and Germany were warm in their support of the Greek demands, and this assertion has derived some confirmation since from the language of Count Mouy, the new French ambassador at Athens, in presenting his credentials to King George. All this means, not that the Powers have any particular affection for Greece, but that they believe that war between Greece and Turkey might result in setting all Europe in a blaze.

There is singularly little news of importance from France. The principal topic in Paris is the fight which has for some time been going on between Gambetta and Rochefort, and which has ended in ruining the latter with his Radical associates. Rochefort flattered himself when he came back to France under the amnesty that his weapons would be as effective against Gambetta as against the Emperor Napoleon, and accordingly announced his intention of overthrowing him by epigrams, "stories," and sarcasms. These were deprived of all force, however, by Gambetta's failure to notice them. Since Rochefort's shameful attack on General de Cissey Gambetta seems to have concluded that the time had come to administer a *coup de grâce*. Accordingly, he published, or caused to be published, in the *République Française*, a letter addressed to him by Rochefort in 1871, after his arrest, begging him in craven terms to intercede for him with M. Thiers, in order to have his life spared. Of course even the Reds cannot stand this, and Rochefort has tried to meet it, like a bull in the arena, by challenging divers persons to fight, and pouring forth torrents of filthy abuse. Gambetta has since reinforced it by proving that he was instrumental in raising by subscription \$5,000 to be sent to Rochefort in Australia, to relieve his necessities and enable him to get home after his escape.

WHAT THE UNITED STATES DO FOR EUROPE.

THE rise of the population of the United States to 50,000,000 (the Southern and Southwestern States, be it observed, having contributed over one-half of the increase since 1870), which has now been ascertained by the census, coupled with the rapid decrease of the public debt, formally and definitively places the Republic among "the great Powers" of the world—that is, amongst the Powers no one of which any other Power could assail without taxing its own resources to the uttermost. Many of the privileges and immunities of this position have, however, been long enjoyed by the United States, owing in part to the unsailableness of their geographical position, and in part to their indifference to the chief objects of European international competition. American diplomatists achieved an amount of success, even before the war, which was due not so much to the moral weight of the Government in European eyes, for it had very little, or to the fear of American powers of aggression, as to the remoteness of American aims and interests from the European arena, and the certainty that no Power could hope to issue creditably or profitably from a quarrel with the United States. The Republic, if attacked, could only be attacked across a stormy ocean. It had no territory which could by any possibility be taken from it and held, and had no capital the capture of which would end the war. And then the things about which it cared greatly, and was ready to fight for, were usually things which any European Power could give up without any loss of influence or prestige in the European forum, in which only influence and prestige had a tangible value for it. One finds all through the European political literature from the beginning of the present century down to 1860, and particularly in memoirs and correspondence in which men's real sentiments about political transactions are brought out, that to both English and Continental publicists the United States occupied the position of a noisy, troublesome fellow, whom it was desirable to gratify in order to avoid petty annoyance, particularly as the things he made a disturbance about were rarely of any consequence. Even American pleas for freedom and equality were treated rather as American modes of "nagging" foreigners than as the utterances of a sincere and honest political apostolate.

The late war, however, effected a profound change in the European view of the United States as a political influence, not so much through the military qualities displayed on either side (for Europe takes its opinions of military matters through professional soldiers, and professional soldiers doubt, as is natural, the exploits and capacity of improvised armies, and of generals fresh from the counting-room or the law-office), but through the popular readiness to be taxed and be drafted. There was nothing more firmly rooted in the mind of European politicians before 1865 than the belief that a comfortable democracy like that of the United States would not be willing to pay with the purse or the person for the gratification of even its most cherished political aspirations. The rise of American credit, therefore, which has been going on steadily for the last ten years, has indicated not simply an increasing confidence in the ability and readiness of the American people to pay the national debt, but a great modification in the ideas of a very large portion, and that the most influential portion, of the European public touching the conditions and nature of popular government. This impression, too, is deepened by what we may call the theatrical rapidity with which the United States' debt is being paid off, and by the prospect, which is gradually opening up, that many of the same persons who saw its creation may witness its total extinction. For it must be remembered that, owing to the fact that no European nation has as yet paid off a large debt, although the foundations of those of Holland, England, and France were laid more than two hundred years ago, and both France, Austria, and Holland have, as we say, "scaled" or "readjusted" their debts, a public debt of large amount has assumed in European eyes somewhat the character of a perpetual national charge, about the final removal of which practical men need not think. There are states, such as Switzerland, which have no debts, and states, like Prussia, whose debts are very small and manageable, and people therefore are familiar with the idea that a state can go on without any debt at all; but the payment within the lifetime of the generation which borrowed the money of a debt of the largest size, has some of the wonderfulness and some of the effects of a great discovery in natural science. It com-

pels a revisal of one's ideas, both of political possibilities and probabilities, which goes down to the very foundations of most men's political philosophy. The effect of it, too, is heightened by what is happening in France. The financial history of the first French Republic was so unfortunate as to furnish a favorite illustration ever since to professors and economists engaged in exposing financial folly and fallacy. It was therefore natural enough to expect that when the present Republic shouldered the debt left by the struggle in which the Empire fell, amounting in all to over \$4,000,000,000, one of two things would happen—either the people would refuse to bear the burden necessary to meet the charges on it; or, if they did bear it, it would greatly reduce their producing power, by diminishing the accumulation of capital. As a matter of fact, however, France has never been so prosperous as since she paid off the Germans. She has an increasing surplus in the revenue, the volume of exports and imports steadily rises, and her industry was never so flourishing. These two examples are producing much more markedly than the fight at Valmy, which Goethe witnessed and set down as the beginning of a new era, the impression that a new force, of the existence of which even fifty years ago men did not dream, has made its appearance in the political laboratory, and, like steam and electricity, is startling people even more by the thought of what it may yet achieve than by anything it has achieved.

There was a somewhat naïve expression of the wonder thus raised in the London *Spectator* the other day, in an article which has called forth much comment here, reproaching the United States with their failure to use the marvellous strength now revealed in doing something for the relief of oppressed and incompetent races and nations elsewhere. They ought, for instance, to accomplish, or aid in accomplishing, the deliverance of Armenia, and ought to go down to Mexico and teach the people of that country how to govern themselves. This is flattering enough, but it reveals a somewhat childlike conception of the nature of the next step in political progress to be taken. It may be safely said that we are very near, if we have not reached, the end of all that war can do for Christendom. The curse of Europe to-day, the great impediment to its growth in wealth and happiness, is the enormous military armaments. The amount of wealth they destroy, both through the taxation they make necessary and the labor they withdraw from the work of production, is prodigious. Barring the loss of life, and the terror and confusion, their effect on industry, even in times of profound peace, closely resembles that of permanent and costly war. But every nation fancies it maintains its fleets and armies either for its own salvation or the deliverance of some other people, and, as a matter of fact, every war in our time takes sooner or later the form of a war of deliverance. Even the late Afghan war, which has cost England over \$100,000,000, which would, if wisely used, have gone far to extinguish pauperism and discontent in Ireland, was represented to be entered upon for the purpose of delivering the unhappy Afghans from the Russians, which must have seemed a strange theory to the Afghans who were hanged and had their villages burnt.

If, in fact, the European Powers would next year give up all idea of delivering or saving anybody by force of arms, and disband or reduce their armies, they would probably give an impetus to material progress, and through it to civilization itself, such as the world has not witnessed since the discovery of America. The mischief of war and of preparation for war is not simply material, it is moral. Every war, even the holiest, leaves behind from one to half-a-dozen heroes—that is, men whose skill in the art of destruction so delights and fascinates their country that they are during the remainder of their lives in a certain sense released from the operation of the ordinary moral standards, and are held up to the admiration of youth with comparatively little regard to their qualities or capacities as peaceful citizens. Now, if there be one service more valuable than another which a republic like the United States can render to the world and to all races of the world, even to the Armenians, at this juncture, it is the successful exhibition of a government without standing armies, and of a society which does not make pets of fighting men. This service the United States is now rendering. The million of men we should have to maintain if we undertook to "deliver" people by "firing a shot," and whom we should probably in off years use in oppressing somebody or quarrelling with somebody, are in the fields and workshops, are married to one million women, and, according to

the best calculated probabilities, the fathers of two children each, making four millions of persons left free in the pursuit of happiness. The sixty thousand or seventy thousand officers of such an army, instead of lounging in cafés or taverns, or flirting on promenades, or passing laborious nights and days and using highly-trained intellectual powers in devising schemes for the destruction of the largest possible number of human beings in the smallest possible space of time, are busy superintending or facilitating the work of producing, transporting, and distributing commodities. This is a spectacle absolutely without precedent. No nation of 50,000,000 has ever before presented it to the world, and there is in it more hope and help for the oppressed than in all the fleets or armies which now cover the waters or darken the land in any part of the world. It is encouragement of the strongest kind to those who live under this terrible military yoke to put an end to it, for it shows that security and prosperity are possible without soldiers. There is, too, a touch of joyous and characteristic humor in the way in which the American Republic celebrates its attaining 50,000,000 of population by "breaking" the European wheat, cheese, and pork market. This mode of exciting hatred and envy has been hitherto unknown, and marks more vividly than anything else the beginning of a political revolution. No force that could be mustered on these shores, and no fleets that we could put to sea, could make the groaning nations of Europe diminish their armies by one company. But it is quite certain that before many years the steady offer of cheaper food than any heavily-taxed people can raise will make the maintenance of these enormous hosts unendurable.

"ROTATION IN OFFICE."

MR. REUBEN E. FENTON, the ex-Senator from this State, is reported as having recently discussed civil-service reform in an interview with a reporter, and as having maintained resolutely the dislike of the American people to anything like permanence in office. His plan of reform would consist in putting excellent men in the offices for short, fixed terms, during which they would not be displaced except for incompetence or misconduct, and then dismissing them to make way for other men of "equal merit." In short, he advocates what is popularly known as the system of "rotation in office," which has, he maintains, a strong hold on the popular mind. Under this system the creation of an official class would be prevented, and the idea of the accessibility of offices to all, which is one of the fundamental principles of a democracy, would be kept alive. The idea is a very old one. It was a favorite notion of the ancient Greek politicians that in a free state every citizen should be held to be qualified for every office, and that every office should be open to him, and that every officeholder should have constantly before his eyes the prospect of laying aside his authority and taking his place once more among the unofficial crowd. Unfortunately, the American advocates of "rotation in office" never explain how their plan is, in a republic like this, to be carried out. Mr. Fenton has not done so. So far as we know, none of them ever has done so. They all say "rotation in office" is the true democratic plan, but they never go on to describe how it can be put in operation. In the absence of this specification it is difficult to discuss their theory. Even in a small democracy like that of ancient Athens, containing about 20,000 male citizens, literal "rotation"—that is, the holding of office by every man in turn—was not possible. There were not, to use the slang phrase of our own day, "enough offices to go round." Unless the terms were made absolutely short every man could not get his turn. Some had to go without offices all their lives. In the Venetian Republic, in which the class eligible to office was still smaller, literal rotation was also impossible, for "rotation" means not the giving to every man an equal chance of office, but giving to every man an opportunity of holding every office. In neither case, therefore, was literal rotation ever attempted. A mixed system had perforce to be resorted to, in which some offices were filled by election and some by lot, and some by a combination of election and lot. Election gave the governed some choice in the selection of the governors, and lot gave all a chance of being made one of the governors. It must be remembered, however, that in both these cases not only was the class eligible to office small, but its members were for the most part as well equipped as knowledge, experience, and constant attention to

politics could make them for any office in the state. If rotation in office was not possible under these circumstances, is it possible in a republic of 50,000,000 of inhabitants, containing say at a moderate estimate 8,000,000 male citizens, all of whom are, as far as abstract right goes, equally entitled to any office in the Government not calling for technical knowledge? How should we introduce rotation in such a republic, there being say only 100,000 offices to be distributed, and eighty persons each with an indisputable claim to serve one term in each office? If I became eligible to office at the age of twenty-one, and the term was four years, it might so happen that my turn would not come round for 316 years. But suppose the term were only one year, I might be left waiting for seventy-nine years. Or suppose death or refusal to serve cut down the number of the other applicants by one-half, I might be left waiting for thirty-nine years, so that I could not be installed until I was sixty years old, which to most men would be a sickening delay, and would probably result in total unfitness for the place by the time it became vacant. Or, to illustrate the theory on a smaller scale, let us suppose the collectorship of this port to be a rotatory office, in which every citizen able to read and write is entitled to serve one term. There are at least 50,000 in this city who would under this rule have a right to fill the place for one term of four years. There must be at least 30,000 who have the qualifications for it of the late collector, Mr. Thomas Murphy. Now, in what order should they be admitted to it? The only mode of settling this order would be by drawing lots, but this would not after all bring the office within the reach of more than a very small number of those entitled to it. With the term of four years twelve of them would occupy it for half a century, so that, even if only one thousand really desired it, a term of this length would inflict monstrous injustice on no less than 888.

It will be easily seen from all this that when politicians talk of "rotation in office," they do not really mean rotation at all. They are mostly shrewd men and are incapable of entertaining any theory so absurd. Mr. Fenton, in the conversation we have referred to, did not use the word rotation, it is true. What he said was, that after a man had held an office for a short term he should make way for another man of "equal merit," and we are, therefore, justified in inferring that those who do talk of rotation really mean what Mr. Fenton probably means, that no man should stay in office permanently, but should give some other man, equally well qualified, an opportunity of filling his place; so that the privilege and profits of office-holding should be distributed among the members of a class possessing a certain amount of capacity. But here again Mr. Fenton and those who agree with him leave us in the dark on the most important feature of the plan. He concedes that all men of equal merit have an equal claim to the place, but he does not say how this claim is to be asserted. There must be in this city, on a moderate computation, two thousand men of "equal merit" with the present Collector of Customs, or any of his recent predecessors. Each one of them has as much abstract right to the office as any other. But we do not understand that Mr. Fenton proposes that when there is a vacancy the Government is to find out how many such men there are, and to give one of them the place, nor does he indicate in what manner the one of the two thousand to whom the first chance should be given would be ascertained. We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that what he proposes is that the present system of selection should continue, but that there should be no removal except for cause during the term.

Now, our objection to this plan is that it is not democratic. The essential principle of democracy is that no man should depend for the enjoyment of any right on the fear or favor of any other man. Therefore, if I have the same right to the collectorship as all others whose qualifications are as good as those of the present Collector, I have a right also to have these qualifications ascertained by some legal test, and then have my turn at the office secured to me by some process which will be as open to me as to anybody else. The present process clearly does not come under this description. In order to secure the collectorship under the system, no display or proof of my qualifications for it would be of the slightest use to me as long as I did not enjoy the friendship of the Senator of the party in power. If I failed in securing his friendship through any cause, I should have no chance of the place whatever. The Presi-

dent, in the first place, would not nominate me unless the Senator requested him to do so. If by any chance—say through a quarrel with the Senator—he did so, there would not be the slightest use in my going before the Senate and showing that the collectorship was a rotatory office, that I and nineteen hundred and ninety-nine other men in the city were as able as the outgoing collector and wished for a turn at the place. Observations of this kind would, in fact, excite much laughter in the Senate; nor would the New York Senator be under the necessity of arguing against me or maintaining that I was not qualified. On the contrary, he would not discuss my claims at all, and would take no notice of the equal-merit theory. He would simply plead the “courtesy of the Senate,” and say he had another man whom he liked better for the place. In other words, he would give his colleagues to understand that I had not fulfilled the chief and only condition of the appointment by securing his favor and support.

Now, this may be a good system. It may be that it is the best that can be devised; but one thing about it is certain—that it is not democratic and that it is not rotatory. Any system of which the motive power is the favor or permission of one man or of a small body of men is essentially aristocratic. Any system which allows Government officers to be selected, whether for long or short terms, by any man who is not directly responsible for the manner in which these officers do their work—that is, who is not their official superior—has no democratic feature in it. Nevertheless, this is now our system. It is not rotation in office, for it contains no provision whatever for giving the office to either the whole body or any small class of citizens, each in his turn. Nor is it a system based on merit, because it provides no means, of which all can avail themselves, of ascertaining whether any candidate has either any merit at all or more merit than his competitors. It is, properly speaking, an aristocratic system—that is, a system based on individual favor—aggravated by short terms and frequent changes. An aristocratic system of appointment which provided for tenure during good behavior (which was substantially the English system before the recent changes), might work tolerably well, although many incompetent persons might through it effect an entrance into the service. But an aristocratic system like ours, in which the patron cannot promise his client security beyond the next election, may be said to be the worst system yet devised. Besides our own country, Spain and Turkey are the only two even nominally civilized countries in which it is maintained, and they are not generally considered models for progressive nations to imitate. The oddest thing about *their* civil service is that, though it has been in operation among them for two centuries at least, ex-Governor Rice, of Massachusetts, and many other politicians of less note maintain that it is an American invention, and was introduced among us in order to adapt our administrative machinery to the needs and tastes of a democratic society. And now Mr. Fenton tries to make us believe that it is democratic and adapted to our needs, because the terms are short, as if it made any difference to the public what the length of a term is if at its expiration the office is not thrown open to some kind of public competition. It would doubtless be a good thing to have the term of an office held by a henchman short, if when it came to an end other people had some chance of it. But when it is sure to be filled again by another henchman what does the country gain by the change? Making this sort of change bear the appearance of “rotation” is a very dextrous trick and has been frequently performed with great success, but it begins to be discovered. We must now have one of two things—either appointment through a process of which any properly qualified man can avail himself and tenure during good behavior, or else real “rotation”—that is, the throwing open of the office to public competition at the end of each short term. In fact, we must have a democratic civil service in a democratic country. An aristocratic civil service has been foisted on us through causes which need not be described here, and it has broken down here, as it broke down in France and in Prussia and in England, and would break down in Spain and Turkey if there were in those countries any lower depth of degradation to be reached. The civil service best suited to the United States has still to be devised, and it must be based on the peculiarities of American human nature. What these are can, for the purposes of administration, be readily ascertained by an examination of the methods by which Americans conduct their private business.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN FRANCE AT THE CLOSE OF THE YEAR 1880.

PARIS, December 17, 1880.

IT cannot be said that the year 1880 is drawing to a peaceful close in France. I do not allude to material trouble—there never was less appearance of an outbreak in the French democracy. Hitherto the people have put their confidence in universal suffrage, and seem resolved to exchange cartridges for ballots. In vain the most powerful incentives resound in the overheated atmosphere of the democratic clubs; they produce no effect after the audience has dispersed. Moreover, the halls in which they are vociferated are less and less thronged, for nothing is more evanescent than exaggerated language which does not respond to any general passion. It was remarked at the last Havre Congress that the furious Socialists, whose sole programme was petroleum, were obliged to withdraw into another room and play their lugubrious farce to empty benches. The old demagogue Blanqui's paper, which bore what he considered an irresistible title, *Without God or Master*, has this morning announced that it will be discontinued. The *Commune*, in which Félix Pyat daily hurled abuse at existing society, has ceased publication for the time being, for want of funds, and its chief writer has fled into Belgium to escape the two years' imprisonment to which he was condemned for the calumny and outrage which have marked its short career. The Municipal Council have rejected M. Rochefort's proposition to erect a monument to the Communists who died in June, 1871. Thus we see the madmen of demagogism have rather lost than gained ground during the second half of 1880.

It must not be forgotten that beneath this foam there are waves which break upon the shore. The Extreme Left are still powerful, and they firmly reckon on obtaining an important place at the next elections. It must be remembered that they can always rely on the support of the Extreme Right; by uniting they nearly overthrew the Ministry on the first day of the session. M. Gambetta is the object of their constant attacks. The Extreme Left wish at any cost to nullify his influence, and they seek to undermine it by every possible means, wrongfully accusing him of preparing underhand a policy likely to lead to a war. In my opinion nothing is more false, for, if he does not wish to see France stand aloof in foreign affairs, he is far from desiring to urge her on an adventurous course. Only madmen could think of such a thing. It is unquestionable that Gambetta aims at taking the direction of public affairs after the coming elections, and that is why he attaches so much importance to the modification of our electoral laws. This will be the chief question at the next parliamentary session. Gambetta would like to substitute the *scrutin de département* for the *scrutin d'arrondissement*, which, by giving a wider basis to elections, makes public opinion predominate over local interests, and secures more thoroughly the influence of a party leader like Gambetta. Deputies named by small circumscriptions are somewhat influenced by their electors, and are liable to think more about their local interests than the greater ones of the country. Hence the difficulty of constituting those solid majorities which form the prop of Government, otherwise at the mercy of a parliament too often in secret guided by petty motives, and, consequently, totally unreliable, causing the Ministry to fall at the first breath of a contrary wind, as has occurred more than once during the present Legislature. It is better for the Government to depend on one large body, that would only resist in cases of real conflict, but, so long as harmony was maintained, would powerfully uphold it in essential things. Gambetta will have much difficulty in getting the *scrutin de département* voted by deputies who have counted on the *scrutin d'arrondissement* for their re-election. Nevertheless, everything leads one to believe he will obtain this result if he struggles for it openly and resolutely, for his influence is overwhelming when he puts forth all his persuasive eloquence. No debate will have more importance in the next session, which precedes the general election. The Right are preparing for it by an increase of political passion. You have, however, seen during the debates on the decrees that they were in a minority, notwithstanding the support of two such eminent Republicans as Messrs. Jules Simon and Dufaure, who influence at least twenty Republican votes.

There yet remains much irritation in parts of the country with regard to the execution of the Second Decree. The most serious symptom is the open opposition which a great number of magistrates show to the Government. I refer not only to the numerous procureurs and advocates-general who tendered their resignations rather than uphold the execution of the decrees before the tribunals, but also to the tribunals and courts in which the judges, taking advantage of their irremovability, claimed their right to judge the agents of the administration in the execution of the decrees, and by the sentences they pronounced condemned the acts of the Government itself. It is this, at times, provoking attitude of the magistracy which has induced the Chamber of Deputies to suspend the judicial fixity of tenure. This law will certainly not pass the Senate, but the bill will none the less be a firebrand in the future elections. For the time being the subject of warm debate between the Republican and Clerical parties is popular education. The same question is

now being discussed in Belgium. The state purposes to take away from the Catholic Church the privilege she claims as a right—viz., the direction of all matters appertaining to public education—and give to the instruction in state establishments a purely neutral and secular character, without which it would do violence to the conscience of the minority. It is an excellent vantage-ground for the Republican party, who are unquestionably in the right as much when they demand that primary instruction shall be compulsory as when they require it to be gratuitous and secular. The Ultramontane party consider themselves as much attacked when their religious orders were expelled, and yet liberty of conscience is in no way involved in this new legislation; it is, on the contrary, sanctioned. But the Ultramontane Church will never consent to abandon this anterior and superior right she claims of giving or superintending the instruction of the country. I think, however, that this great reform, already voted by the Chamber of Deputies, will pass in the Senate. It will certainly be the most creditable achievement of the present Chambers, though one for which the Republican party have received the most abuse. Nothing can adequately depict the exasperation of the Clerical Right at this moment. One must have witnessed some of the scenes in both Chambers since their reassembling to form any idea of the violence into which political, and especially religious, passion may betray men, even those accustomed to the best society and frequently belonging to the oldest nobility. This proves that we have reached the decisive moment of the great struggle between the French revolution, the old privileged classes, and state religion. The coming election will undoubtedly show that the Republicans are not losing ground. The Republic has nothing more to fear from her enemies; Bonapartism is dying out in internal dissensions carried to a scandalous extreme. The Royalists succeed only in drinking toasts to the "Child of the Miracle," who will not accomplish one to regain the throne of his fathers. The present institutions in France have only to fear their own adherents, if, elated by victory, they neglect the rules of wisdom and true liberalism. É.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VICTOR HUGO'S GENIUS.—II.

PARIS, December 10, 1880.

THE début of Victor Hugo as a dramatist cannot be said to have been a happy one. His first drama was "Cromwell," which appeared in 1828; the second was "Hernani, ou l'honneur castillan," which was represented at the Théâtre Français on February 25, 1830. The representation was a great literary event—it was a sort of Homeric duel between the "Romantiques" and the "Classiques." There are few survivors of the terrible struggle which followed the appearance of "Hernani," and our literary passions are now so cooled that we are able to do justice to the qualities of Hugo's drama without repudiating Racine and Corneille. Nobody would speak now as Théophile Gautier did of "ce polisson de Racine," and we are no longer disposed to dissect the style of "Hernani" in the spirit of the critics of 1830. We allow ourselves to be transported by the poetical and dramatic genius of its author without going minutely into the details, without quarrelling over historical details or petty absurdities, or the heavy pleasantry, or the defects in the "local color." The Romantics had a great love for this "local color," but they are wanting in it almost as much as the Classics, and *Don Carlos* does not resemble Charles V. much more than Corneille's *Augustus* resembles Caesar Augustus, or Racine's *Agamemnon* resembles the King of Kings. There is an historic truth, and there is a poetic truth which is just as good as the other. "Hernani" appears to us now not as a representation of Spain, but as an admirable poem of vengeance, of chivalry, of love, and it has perhaps been better appreciated lately than in 1830, especially as we had an excellent, wild, uncontrollable *Hernani* in the person of Mounet-Sully, an admirable *Don Carlos* in the person of the calm, proud, intelligent Worms, and an inimitable *Doña Sol* in the person of the actress whom it is now the good fortune of the New World to possess, the Helen of the stage, for whom two worlds might well fight. If we consider "Hernani" as a part of a great whole, we must see in it the rehabilitation of the bandit, the outcast, the man thrown forcibly out of the conventional rules of society.

The copies of the original edition of "Hernani" (published at Paris by Delaunay-Vallée) are now very rare. I have seen the copy sent by Hugo to Mlle. Mars, who was the first *Doña Sol*. Mlle. Mars would not, could not, recite:

"Vous êtes, mon lion, superbe et généreux."

To the despair of Victor Hugo, she said:

"Vous êtes, mon seigneur, superbe et généreux."

She was a "Classic." Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt, when she repeats the verse, throws her two arms like two paws on the shoulders of *Hernani*, her "lion." There is a lithograph by Deveria which can be added to the copy of "Hernani"; it represents *Hernani* on the ground, dying; *Doña Sol* leans over him; *Ruy Gomez* is on the left, in a domino, with his mask in his hand.

"Mort ! non pas !... nous dormons...
Il dort ! c'est mon époux, vois-tu ? nous nous aimons,
Nous sommes couchés là. C'est notre nuit de nocce...
Ne le réveiller pas, seigneur Duc de Mendocce...
Il est las..."

There is no finer scene in Shakspeare.

The Classics avenged themselves by many parodies on "Hernani." One is very funny, called "Harnali, ou la Contrainte par cor," by A. de Lauzanne. It is quite true that Hugo's style can be very easily parodied; I will even go so far as to say that it often seems to be its own parody. There is a curious want in Victor Hugo of what the French call "esprit," a certain naïveté, a total ignorance of the ridiculous. "Marion Delorme" came out in 1831; it is a historical drama, which is still played at times. We must see in it the rehabilitation of the courtesan, as *Hernani* was the rehabilitation of the bandit. *Marion* is the heroine; she is an outcast of society, but she has all the virtues. This theory of the rehabilitation of vice and ugliness in all forms has been the groundwork of all the conceptions of Hugo since 1830; it may not have been a conscious theory, but we shall see its development throughout all his gigantic work. It is very apparent in "Notre Dame de Paris," first published by Charles Gosselin in 1831, in two volumes 8vo. As this edition is exceedingly rare, I will describe it. The two volumes have a yellow cover, with a woodcut representing "Quasimodo grimacing in the window of the great Hall of the Palace." The first volume has on its title-page a woodcut, by Tony Johannot, representing "Esmeralda helping Quasimodo to drink." The second volume has a woodcut, by the same, representing the "Amende honorable." Eleven hundred copies of these two volumes were printed, and composed the first four editions, which consequently only differ by the title and what we call the "faux-titre" (bastard title). This small number of copies explains the great rarity of the first four editions. In 1831 there appeared a smaller edition, in four volumes 12mo, with two more woodcuts: one, "Esmeralda dancing on the parvis Notre Dame," and one, "Esmeralda taken to the gibbet." There is no difference of text between the duodecimo and the octavo editions. The small edition was printed to the extent of 2,000 copies, which furnished what may be called three false editions, the 5th, the 6th, the 7th, which only differ in their titles. In reality the second edition of "Notre Dame de Paris," in a literary sense—that is, with changes and additions—appeared in 1832 with a new preface and three new chapters—"Impopularité," "Abbas beati Martini," "Ceci tuera cela." This second edition (which is marked as the 8th) is therefore valuable; it forms three octavo volumes, and was published by Renduel, who became about that time the principal publisher of the Romantics. This 8th edition was a part of the first collective edition of the works of Victor Hugo, undertaken by Renduel; for this reason it has for its general title "Œuvres de Victor Hugo; Romans," and the volumes are marked iii., iv., and v. In 1836 Renduel published the first edition of "Notre Dame de Paris," with engravings, in one volume 8vo; this great work, which had become very popular, was afterwards illustrated by the first artists of the time (in 1844), by Daubigny, Tony Johannot, Meissonier, etc. The book is now hunted by all the admirers of Meissonier on account of the fine engraving which represents Louis XI. at the Bastille, and forms a necessary part of the "work" of Meissonier.

I return now to the chronological order. After his great prose novel Victor Hugo published, in 1832, a volume of poetry, the "Feuilles d'Automne," which formed a volume of the precious Collective Edition of Renduel. The volumes of this collection can still be found, but they will soon become excessively rare. The "Feuilles d'Automne" marks the beginning of the second poetical manner of Hugo, the first manner being characterized by the "Odes et Ballades" and the "Orientales."

"Le Roi s'amuse" was only played once, on November 22, 1832; the next day the new drama was interdicted as being insulting to royalty. *Triboulet* was the incarnation of the king's fool, and was the hero of the drama. Renduel published "Le Roi s'amuse" in 1832, with a fine frontispiece, after Tony Johannot: *Triboulet*, in his black velvet dress of the first and only representation, is seen near *Blanche* half drawn out of the bag and dead; on the left is the house of the bravo, in the background the Seine and the door of the Tournelles. The scene is quite familiar to all the admirers of "Rigoleto." "Lucrezia Borgia" forms volume v. of the Drama in the Collective Edition of Renduel, which appeared in 1833. The piece was represented for the first time on the stage of the Porte-St.-Martin on February 2, 1833. Célestin Nanteuil, who was the most "Romantic" illustrator of the period, made two etchings for "Lucrezia Borgia": one, the frontispiece, represents *Lucrezia* giving the poison to *Gennaro*; the other represents the banquet in the Palazzo Negrone. On the stage the effect of this famous scene is rather too "romantic"; the sublime is here too near the ridiculous. All the guests have drunk poison; black and white penitents enter the stage in procession; *Donna Lucrezia* appears at the middle door and says, "Vous êtes chez moi." *Lucrezia Borgia* is, in the drama of Victor Hugo, very unlike the *Lucrezia* who has lately been rehabilitated by a historian; she is still the poetic, the criminal *Lucrezia*. After "Lucrezia" came "Marie Tudor," in which his-

torical truth is even less respected, if this be possible, but which is much superior in dramatic effect. When you have once taken your *parti*, as the French say, when you have made up your mind that you are in a very unreal London, in an unreal court, in an unreal world, you can receive much enjoyment from "Marie Tudor." The drama was published in 1833 by Renduel in the Collective Edition, where it forms volume vi. of the Drama. It had first been announced in Renduel's catalogue under the title of "Marie d'Angleterre, ou Souvent femme varie." Nanteuil made again the frontispiece, which is very characteristic of the Romantic school of etching.

We pass over a 'Study of Mirabeau,' a mere pamphlet of ninety-one pages, which appeared in 1834 (Adolphe Guyot and Urbain Canel); another pamphlet, 'Claude Gueux,' an extract from the *Revue de Paris*, published in 1834 by Everat, and come to the 'Chants du Crépuscule,' poems in what I have called the second manner, which form a volume (volume v. of the "Poésies") in the Collective Edition of Renduel, published in 1835; to "Angelo, tyran de Padoue" (volume vii. of the Drama in the Collective Edition), which also appeared in 1835. In "Angelo" we find the glorification of the courtesan. Hugo is following his unconscious plan; he takes, one by one, all the vices, all the sins, and attempts to turn them into virtues. "Le beau c'est le laid, le laid c'est le beau." All is in all; the abyss of human conscience is a sort of chaos.

"Ah! n'insultez jamais une femme qui tombe;
Qui sait sous quel fardeau sa pauvre âme succombe?"

Poetry here gives her hand to Christianity; it preaches mercy, forgiveness, atonement; it calls to itself the despised, the neglected, the miserable, the worms of society. It deifies what we condemn, it despises what we deify. The most intense and painful expression of this theory is found in *Ruy Blas*, the valet who becomes the minister, beloved by his queen, and who from minister becomes valet again. Even on the stage of the Théâtre Français there is something so excessive in "Ruy Blas" that I cannot hear it without a sort of physical suffering, notwithstanding all the beauty of a few scenes. "Ruy Blas" appeared in 1838; in the interval between "Angelo" and "Ruy Blas," in 1837, Victor Hugo had published (through Renduel) the 'Voix Intérieures,' with a dedication to "Joseph Léopold Sigisbert, Comte Hugo, nom inscrit sur l'arc de triomphe de l'étoile." "Les Rayons et les Ombres," published by Delloye in 1840, is in the same poetical vein. This second poetic manner might be called the grey manner of Hugo; and the titles themselves seem to express it—*crépuscules, ombres, automne*. They have no longer the sun of the 'Orientales'; they are not ponderous and apocalyptic like the poems of the third manner, the 'Contemplations,' etc. In this same year, 1840, Hugo published an ode, "Le Retour de l'Empereur" (Delloye). He was still in the Bonapartist mood; he was not yet the poet of the "Châtiments." While pursuing this bibliographical track I cannot help being amazed at the fertility of Victor Hugo's mind, and I am afraid of all that there is still before me from 1840 to 1880.

Correspondence.

TURNER'S DRAWINGS FOR THE LIBER STUDIORUM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Rawlinson has in preparation a second edition of his very valuable Description and Catalogue of Turner's 'Liber Studiorum,' and he is desirous of learning if any of the original sepia drawings for the Liber plates are in America. Most of the drawings are in the National Gallery, some are in private collections in England, but a few of them cannot be traced, and it has been supposed that one or more might have been brought to this country. The drawings concerning which information is wanted are:—

- No. 5. Basle.
- " 35. Inverary-Pier, Loch Fyne. Morning.
- " 36. From Spenser's 'Faery Queen.'
- " 40. Mildmay Sea Piece.
- " 44. Calm.
- " 50. Mer de Glace, Chamouni.
- " 55. Entrance of Calais Harbor.
- " 62. Watercress Gatherers.
- " 66. Asacus and Hesperia.
- " 69. Ben Arthur, Scotland.
- " 70. Interior of a Church.
- " 82. The Felucca.
- " 83. The Stork and Aqueduct.
- " 84. The Lost Sailor.
- " 90. Narcissus and Echo.

Should any of your readers know of the whereabouts of any of these drawings I shall be greatly obliged if they will take the trouble to communicate the information to me.—Very truly yours,

C. E. NORTON.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., January 2, 1881.

THE BROOKLYN "LAUNDRY ORDINANCE."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Brooklyn Aldermen, after the manner of their kind, have stultified themselves by the passage of their ordinance which permits the issuing of laundry licenses "only to persons who are citizens of the United States."

As the Chinese are the only resident foreigners of any considerable numbers who are debarred from the advantages of naturalization under our laws, and so neither are nor can become "citizens," and as laundry work is the industry in which the majority who have settled in Brooklyn are engaged, the burden of this ordinance, if enforced, will fall almost entirely upon them. That this was intended seems clear. Indeed, Mr. James Donovan, "of the Democratic Twelfth Ward," who offered the resolution, is reported to have said "warmly" in support of his action that he was opposed to the Chinese and to giving them any encouragement, for fear that "if the flood-gates of immigration should be thrown open to them" they would "sweep over our country in such multitudes that they might become, not the masters of any party, color, or nationality, but masters of all white men," and more to the same effect, after the manner of Kearney and the Sandlotters.

Petty and invalid legislation of this sort against the Chinese, though quite novel here, is an old enough story on the Pacific Coast, as readers of the *Nation* know. Still, it seems a pity that even aldermen should waste their time in passing nugatory edicts when they might have spared themselves the trouble by a merely cursory examination of the California Reports. The "Laundry Ordinance" (No. 1264, San Francisco, 15th March, 1876) and the "Cue Ordinance" (No. 1294, San Francisco, 14th June, 1876) were of the same type as the Brooklyn ordinance. The first was passed over the Mayor's veto, and subsequently declared invalid by County Judge Stanley in *People vs. Soon Kung*, 9th July, 1874. The second came before Judges Fields and Sawyer, of the U. S. Circuit Court, July, 1879, in the case of *Ah Kow vs. Nunan* (5 Sawyer, 552).

The latter ordinance provided that prisoners confined in the county jail for criminal offences should have their hair cropped close to the head. Nunan, who was Sheriff of San Francisco, subjected the plaintiff to this treatment, despite the protest that in his case it operated as "a cruel and unusual punishment," and the Chinaman sued him. The ordinance was pleaded in defence, but judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the ordinance pronounced void on the ground that, although general in its terms, it operated with exceptional severity upon a special class, and was thus "subject to the legal objection of intended hostile legislation against them."

The court expressly said, "The class character of this legislation is none the less manifest because of the general terms in which it is expressed"—an opinion which was echoed by Judge Cooley in his comments on the case (*Amer. Law Reg.*, vol. xviii. p. 684). Not only adjudicated decisions, but statute law as well, cover the question. The national legislature has declared (*U. S. Rev. Stat.*, § 1977) that "all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts . . . as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishments, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other." Notice that the distinction between "citizens" and "persons within the jurisdiction of the United States" is clearly marked, and both classes given the equal protection and encouragement of the law.

Moreover, the officer authorized to issue licenses who refuses the application of a Chinaman may find himself personally liable, for it is a question whether such refusal might not be construed as "subjecting" the person refused "to the deprivation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws" within the meaning of Sec. 1979 *U. S. Rev. Stat.*

It is said that Mayor Howell will disregard this ordinance, and issue licenses, as he will certainly be justified in doing, without regard to race, color, or nationality. If he do not, it is to be hoped that the first Chinaman refused a license will promptly apply to the courts for a peremptory enforcement of his rights.—Very truly yours,

GEORGE WALTON GREEN.

11 PINE STREET, NEW YORK, January 3, 1881.

REORGANIZATION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I expected to see in the *Nation* of December 23 some suggestions from a more able member of the New York State bar than myself relative to your criticisms of the recommendations of the Attorney-General for the relief of the Supreme Court of the United States. If the scheme suggested by him for that purpose were new and untried I should have much greater hesitation in expressing thus publicly my approval of it.

The principal features of the scheme are the following:

1st. Intermediate courts of appellate jurisdiction, which shall arrest and finally dispose of many of the causes which now hasten from the trial courts to the Supreme Court of the United States.

2d. An absolute right of appeal to the Supreme Court only in cases involving a certain amount of property.

3d. Power in the intermediate courts to allow appeals to the Supreme Court in cases of peculiar difficulty involving a less amount.

These are the precise features of the scheme upon which the appellate courts of this State are organized. The General Terms of the Supreme Court are our intermediate courts of appellate jurisdiction, and they perform for our Court of Appeals precisely the same office which the proposed Federal courts are expected to perform for the Supreme Court of the United States. An absolute right of appeal to the Court of Appeals exists only in cases involving at least \$500. In all cases involving a less sum, and in the multitude of petty cases arising in courts of justices of the peace and similar tribunals, the decision of the General Term is final, unless it allows an appeal from its decision on the ground that a question of law is involved which ought to be reviewed by the Court of Appeals.

This scheme, which has for a number of years been in use in this State, is, I believe, not open to the objections which you urge against it. The General Terms recognize the authority of the Court of Appeals and consider its declaration of the law as binding upon them. They also respect each other's decisions and invariably follow them unless, as occasionally but very rarely happens, they are convinced that an error has been committed; and in the latter case, at the request of a suitor, permission to go to the Court of Appeals would hardly be refused and the doubtful question would there be settled. Conflict of opinion between our General Terms is rare, and becoming more so as promptness in the publication of their decisions is increased. There is no doubt that our Court of Appeals would be speedily and hopelessly buried under a mass of unfinished business were it not for the vast number of causes disposed of by the General Terms. Of course the successful working of such a scheme as that suggested by the Attorney-General is a much stronger argument in its favor than any which can be adduced against it.

I might say, however, a few words in reply to one of the objections urged against the scheme. It would, of course, be more like an ideal system if every suitor could have his case decided by the highest tribunal in the land; but this is manifestly impossible. The only limitation which the spirit of our institutions will suffer to be placed upon the desire of suitors in this direction is one based upon the importance of their respective causes. This importance must arise either from the magnitude of the amount or the importance of the legal questions involved. Therefore, the logical course is to prohibit any case involving less than a certain amount from going to the Supreme Court, unless it is rendered important by the questions of law involved. Its importance from this latter consideration must be determined by some tribunal. Necessity designates the intermediate court as such tribunal. The Supreme Court might as well decide all causes on the merits as to determine what are of sufficient importance to be decided by it.

There are many other things which might be said upon this subject, but I refrain from further extending the present communication.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., December 27, 1880.

SUBSCRIBER.

[A pecuniary limit of \$500 and a strong intermediate appellate court would no doubt answer very well. Our correspondent seems to think that because a \$500 limit works successfully a \$10,000 limit would work well also. Of course in a certain sense this is true; but a \$100,000 limit would work a great deal better: it would clear the Supreme Court docket of almost all appeals. As to the discretionary right of appeal, this is a matter of comparative indifference if the pecuniary limit is a low one. But the main thing is to have a strong intermediate court. With a bench of able judges between the *nisi prius* judges and the Supreme Court the relief of the latter would be certain and permanent.—ED. NATION.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have read with much interest your recent article on the Supreme Court of the United States. While cordially agreeing with all you have written, I venture to offer you my own views on the subject.

The Judiciary Act (*Rev. Stat.*, sec. 606) provides that the Chief-Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court shall be allotted among the circuits by an order of the court entered on the record; and section 610 of the same act provides that it shall be the duty of the Chief-Justice and of each justice of the Supreme Court to attend at least one term of the Circuit Court in each district of the circuit to which he is allotted during every period of two years.

Without going into details, it is sufficient to say that the number of districts is from three to eight in each circuit, or an average of more than five, which gives an average of more than two terms of the Circuit Court to be held by each justice of the Supreme Court in each year. Now, by relieving the Chief-Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of this duty, it

is apparent that they will have a great deal more time for the exercise of what may be called their proper functions on the Supreme bench. To an ordinary observer the spectacle of the justices of the Supreme Court going about the country holding Circuit Courts while they are three years behind in the call of their own docket is, to say the least, an extraordinary one. They now hold a short term of the Supreme Court once a year, during which they listen to elaborate arguments in a few cases—a small proportion of the number on the docket—and the rest of the year is spent in considering these cases, in writing the opinions, and in circuit duty. In the present emergency, and until the docket shall be cleared off, let the court hold longer sessions, hear shorter arguments, and give its whole time to its own business.

This may be easily accomplished by appropriate legislation. It may be objected that such a change would obstruct the business of the Circuit Courts; but to that it may be replied that it is easy to make more circuit or district judges. We hear very little complaint of large dockets in the Circuit Courts, and I believe the Circuit Courts of the United States are less burdened in that way than the State courts in the same circuits. Suits are often brought in the United States courts because they will be tried sooner than if brought in the State court, and if the dockets of the United States courts were to become overburdened the evil would correct itself by the bringing of fewer suits. Besides, if less business were for a time done in the Circuit Courts, this would of itself relieve the Supreme Court of some new business and enable it to reach the end of its docket.

I wish to add a few words to what you have said in regard to the right of appeal. It is not alone in the final decision of a case, which is often the verdict of a jury, that error is committed or injustice done. The rulings of the court in the course of the trial, in admitting or excluding evidence, or the statement of the law in the charge to the jury, which has been forcibly called "the last speech," are quite as important to be reviewed by an appellate court as a final judgment. Every suitor is entitled to a trial according to the law of the land as declared by the Supreme Court; and to exclude proper evidence offered by a party to a suit, to admit improper evidence against him, or to state erroneously the law in the charge to the jury, may deprive a person of his property "without due process of law" as well as the denial of a trial by jury altogether. Let us have no further restriction of the right of appeal.

The greatest despot of our land is the United States circuit judge. In cases involving less than \$5,000 he is absolute—the end of the law. However wrong his decision may be, however contrary to established principles of law or the decisions of the Supreme Court, *he cannot be reviewed*, and, however learned or honest, it is certain that he cannot be always right. ***

CHICAGO, Dec. 30, 1880.

Notes.

THE Society for Political Education has issued its first Economic Tract—a lecture by Edward Atkinson, delivered last March before the Finance Club of Harvard University, entitled: "What is a Bank? What Service does it Perform?" This pamphlet, which is for the members of the Society and not for general sale, has on its covers a full statement of the aims of the organization, its management, conditions of membership, etc. Its secretaries at present are, for the East, R. L. Dugdale, 79 Fourth Avenue, N. Y., and for the West, M. L. Scudder, jr., 40 Portland Block, Chicago.—Rand & McNally, Chicago, have in preparation a 'Cyclopædia of Political Science and Political Information,' embracing Political Economy and the Political History of the United States. The work will be edited by Mr. J. J. Lalor, and we hope that the publishers have given him an ample allowance of time for so serious and important undertaking, in which the leading specialists of the country will doubtless be enlisted.—We spoke last week of a pamphlet on "Books and Reading for the Young." We have since been interested in perusing a pamphlet reprint from articles in the *Evening Post* on "Self-Government in Schools," by John MacMullen (New York, 1262 Broadway). A wholesome effect might be anticipated from its being read by school-boys as well as by their parents. It will fix their attention.—J. R. Osgood & Co. are preparing to publish a reprint, with revisions, of the series of letters from Germany on the philosophical movement in that country which have appeared from time to time in the *Nation* during the past few years. The author is Mr. G. Stanley Hall, formerly of Cambridge, Mass.—D. Lothrop & Co., Boston, publish immediately, 'Ten Little Southerners,' by Mary W. Porter, of Louisiana.—The *Rugbian* newspaper is the new means of communication with the outer world devised by the Rugby Colony of Morgan County, Tenn. The subscription price is 50 cents for six months.—The bound volumes iv. and v. of the *Magazine of American History* (A. S. Barnes & Co.) are a reminder what steady progress this excellent periodical has made under its present management. At the proper time we hope a more attractive typography will be adopted. The page is just too broad for rapid reading and, we believe, for easy retention in memory.—The Report of the U. S. Fish

Commissioner for 1878 has just issued from the Government Printing-Office—a thick volume of nearly 1,000 pages.—We have received from the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts School for the Blind, Boston, the second revised and electrotyped edition of a 'Brief Account of the Most Celebrated Diamonds,' translated from the German by Julia R. Anagnos. It is a beautiful specimen of relief printing.—*Nature* for Dec. 9, 1880, presents two maps showing the spread of phylloxera in France since 1865, and also completely invaded districts in which the introduction of foreign vines is authorized. The accompanying article, by a French authority, asserts that a remedy has been found in the application of sulpho-carbonate of potassium.—B. Westermann & Co. send us the *Almanach de Gotha* for the current year, in which the chief changes are administrative, as, notoriously, in the case of England, France, Germany, and Russia. To the next volume (the 119th) are perforce deferred the census statistics taken in the twelvemonth just elapsed. Meanwhile the *Almanach* continues the wonderfully full and accurate storehouse of political information that it has ever been. A portrait of Mr. Gladstone, quite clerical-looking, is one of the regulation four.—The death is announced in Boston of Epes Sargent, a most industrious writer for the press, the stage, the school, who achieved distinction in each of these lines, as well as in poetry. His yet sung "Life on the Ocean Wave" is, unless we except his text-books, likely to be the most permanent production of his very bright and versatile genius.

—The January *Catholic World* is a representative number of that excellent magazine, and two of its articles taken together—"The Louisiana of Creole Days" and "The English of To-day"—serve to illustrate the character of the Roman Catholic periodical of the first class published amid the bleak Saxon and Protestant surroundings of this country. Its point of view is invariable and universal, but it is twofold, and readers who look upon the *Catholic World* as simply striking the lyre of literature with the plectrum of Catholicism, to employ appropriately exuberant phraseology, commit a grave mistake. The criticisms of the *Catholic World* are not only Catholic but Milesian, and until this is grasped the reader of the trenchant essays it contains will miss their secret and conceive of them amiss, and very likely charge upon the Celtic genius or the Catholic standpoint individually, as the case may be, the exclusive idiosyncrasies of Irish Catholicism. "The Louisiana of Creole Days" is an Irish-Catholic review of Mr. Cable's 'Grandissimes,' with the Catholic preponderance, and "The English of To-day" an Irish-Catholic review of Justin McCarthy's 'History of Our Own Times,' with the Celtic feeling uppermost; but neither is purely Celtic, nor purely Catholic, any more than either is colorless, after the manner of so much modern criticism. The following extract will illustrate this:

"While we are willing to admit that in the first decade of the century, and much later, women may have been foolish enough to believe in the voodoo charms and rites, we do not think that a devout little Catholic going to early Mass and frequent confession would have had recourse to them. Mr. Cable forgets how free from the taint of the witchcraft madness and persecution is the history of all the Catholic colonies. It was in Protestant New England that that faithless and cruel frenzy raged like a fire, not in Catholic St. Augustine or Maryland. In our own time it is in intellectual Boston that the papers are filled with the advertisements of clairvoyants and mind-readers—sixty, we are told, in the Boston, to ten in the New York, papers. . . ."

However much a pious Catholic might want to write this, it is clear, we think, that only a pious Irish Catholic could contribute the *dan* requisite to carry it off successfully. And very nearly the same thing may be said of the excellent review of Justin McCarthy's history. It concludes with the words: "If the English people have only the grace to recognize their portrait, the author may congratulate himself on having achieved what in itself is no mean success. One of the best aids to make a man do right is to see himself as others see him." But then it is also necessary to acquaint him with the view-point of the said others, and the reviewer performs this service by considering a 'History of Our Own Times' solely as an exhibition of the "dulness" of "creeping Saxons."

—Mr. John Fiske contributes a chapter of sociology to the January *North American Review* on "The Philosophy of Persecution," which is good reading. The persecuting spirit has not ceased to influence men's actions, but it is regarded as a trait to be disguised and ashamed of, and "while the representatives of the current orthodoxy would once have roasted you with pious exultation, they are now fain to content themselves with turning you out of an office, and with an apologetic air at that." To account for this is the endeavor of the essay, and at the outset it attacks Buckle's theory that men have not improved morally but only intellectually, in support of which Buckle's principal argument was drawn from the history of persecution. Every one remembers the implied syllogism—persecution is immoral; the best Roman emperors, instead of the worst, persecuted the Christians; therefore they must have been guided by an erroneous theory of duty. Buckle has, perhaps, too few rather than too many admirers at the present time, and it is not difficult to point out not only incidental but fundamental defects in his work; but what Mr. Fiske points out here is as easily overlooked as it is deserv-

ing of being borne in mind. Buckle's error, he says, "consists in the attempt to assign distinct parts to elements of human nature that in reality cannot be separated." For "school-room purposes" it is well enough to consider the intellectual and moral faculties separately, but to try to do so in examining "concretely any actual group of human phenomena" is futile. A commoner error than this, in "concrete" examination which admits of it, it would be hard to find, and we have no doubt it is equally prevalent in speculation—even if that is an essentially different thing. The necessities of didactic purposes have an unfortunate momentum, and long after they have done duty in exposition one finds them in active operation in argument. Even in sociology there is danger to be feared from them, it is often so difficult to tell whether sociology is in what may be called the expository state or has passed into the realm of discussion.

—The fourth number of the *Journal of the Military-Service Institution of the United States* contains an article contributed by General Sherman in the form of a letter to General Hancock on the subject of Military Law. It is a curious illustration of the loose views prevailing on this subject that a considerable part of the letter is made up of copious extracts from an opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered some three years ago in the case of *Williams vs. Bruffy*, a case which had nothing whatever to do with military law. It simply decided that the confiscation by the Confederate States of debts due to citizens of loyal States, enforced by the payment of equivalent sums into the Confederate treasury, was no defence to actions to recover these debts after the war. The opinion was delivered by Judge Field, and proceeded, partly upon a distinction between the ordinary case of violent seizure of property by an unlawful combination too powerful to be successfully resisted, and the case of an intangible debt which cannot, like personal property, be seized or actually taken away, and partly upon the inconsistency which would be displayed by a nation if, after successfully suppressing a rebellion, it should through its judicial tribunals recognize as valid attempts of the rebels to confiscate debts due to loyal citizens as a penalty for their loyalty. Military law, properly speaking, means that branch of the domestic law of any nation which relates to the government of its military forces in time of peace or war. In the United States it is, as General Sherman points out, contained in scattered acts of Congress, but also in the great body of orders and regulations issued from time to time by military authority. Congress has never established, as Great Britain has done, a complete code upon the subject. Martial law, if the term is to be used with any accuracy, is something entirely different from military law, and is properly not law at all, but a temporary system introduced in time of war by the commanding general of an invading or occupying army as a substitute for the ordinary law of the country; its permanent principles cannot be ascertained or described, because they vary with the disposition and circumstances of the general through whom they are put in force. General Sherman gives a very good illustration of martial law, properly so-called, in the regulations introduced by General Scott at the time of our invasion of Mexico. Part of General Scott's martial law was that the ordinary administration of justice should go on without interruption, except in cases in which anybody connected with the army was a party, or in "political cases"; and also that, in consideration of the capital of Mexico being placed "under the special safeguard of the faith and honor of the American army," the corporate authorities of the city should be charged with the duty of raising \$150,000, to be appropriated to the use of the invaders of the country. It may be very true that martial law of this kind is "in the highest sense humane," but to say that it is founded "in abstract justice" or "the laws of nature" is entirely misleading. No one has ever yet been able to discover what either abstract justice or the laws of nature are, and the introduction of them into discussions of this character is only confusing. General Sherman's article is mainly valuable as pointing out the necessity of a uniform body of military law for the United States. Congress ought to undertake this at an early date.

—An anonymous Washington correspondent sends us evidence designed to dissipate the notion prevalent in official circles that the civil-service reform which would put a competitive examination between an applicant and an office is inhumane as well as unpractical. It consists of a few extracts cut from a little book which "shows how to apply for an office and how to push the application to success." There is every appearance of good faith about these, and we give our readers the benefit of several of them. The first requisite for the applicant is to get "the Representative, or such political leader as he is obliged to depend upon, interested in his case and satisfied of his good repute and ability." But after this he must by no means imagine victory assured, but must take charge of "the case" himself in great measure, "always acting on the theory" that the political leader "forgets all about it as soon as he is out of sight or hearing every time"—this "for a definite time, say a short month." Then, if he makes no progress, he should abandon his efforts "long enough to enable his friends and backers to get over fatigue and doubtfulness." He should bear in mind the mutability of human affairs and "never feel sure of appointment till appointed." Modesty is

apparently a great error; the applicant "should never fear that he is saying or doing too much himself," and should remember that the more active and persistent he is "the more anxious they [the political leaders] will be to regain their own peace by getting him placed as speedily as possible." "Lastly, he must feel, and act upon the feeling, that he is engaged in a desperate struggle" with a host of competitors as eager, and no doubt as competent, for the position sought as himself. Among less systematic hints the advice is given to become known to the party committees "as a zealous and useful worker for the party." In this way "persons desirous of federal employment . . . may materially strengthen their claims." Ways and means are described as follows:

"The collection of funds, the getting-up of clubs and public demonstrations, the winning over of known political opponents among the voters, the listing of every doubtful voter, so that each one may be personally reached by influence, oral argument, and suitable printed matter, the detection and pointing out of opportunities or obstacles in townships or other small districts, the scrutiny of registration lists, the bringing up of absent voters to the polls, and the challenging of illegal voters, are among the services capable of being performed by almost any aspirant for public office, and, if well performed, certain to be appreciated in the proper quarters."

The niggardliness of our correspondent is tantalizing. The circular which advertises the book closes, he says, with the assertion, "Nothing like it ever before published," and it certainly ought to form part of every civil-service reformer's library. We shall be glad to pay liberally for a complete copy.

—In the last session of Congress the Naval Committee reported a bill authorizing the Government to initiate an international commission for determining standard tests of color-perception and visual power, and standard requirements of these faculties for the naval and merchant marines. The British Government has been recently memorialized on this subject by the Ophthalmological Section of the British Medical Association and by the new Ophthalmological Society of Great Britain and Ireland. These memorials have been endorsed by the Periodic Congress of Ophthalmology which met at Milan in September. The several maritime nations which would take part in an international commission of such importance and value are now awaiting the action of the United States, for which Congress must make provision before adjournment. If Congress should not be called together in March, and this bill be overlooked or pushed aside during the present session, then our Government could not act till after December next, and England can, in the meantime, initiate the commission and take the credit of so doing. A similar international commission for the European railroads has been advised by a commission appointed by the Minister of Public Works of Belgium "to report on all the relations of color-blindness to railroads." Their thorough and very practical report concludes by urging the Belgian Government to initiate at once such an international commission, referring to the memorials above-mentioned and the proposed action of the United States. The same general rules and regulations and standards of vision as proposed by the Belgian Commission are reported by the Higher Railroad Commissioners of France to the Minister of Public Works in response to his circular of December 27, 1879, to the railroad corporations. The recent report of the Surgeon-General of the U. S. Marine Hospital service tells us of the number of color-blind pilots found, and the extraordinary efforts and pressure used to keep them in their places, to the further danger of our lives and property. The report of the Inspector-General of Steam Vessels gives us the result of the investigation of one collision at least due to color-blindness, by which ten lives were sacrificed. The examinations carried out by the several departments of our Government have not resulted in fixing the proper standards. A comparatively low standard was recently violently resisted for the railroads in Connecticut, where office-seekers rallied on the side of a few defective employees and brought color-blindness into politics. The results of an international commission would at once settle all such questions and establish standards both fair and safe.

—The production of "Yorick's Love" at the Park Theatre has proved very successful. The play is Spanish in origin, and was brought out some years since in this city—if we remember aright, at the Fifth Avenue Theatre. It did not at that time prove a success, chiefly owing to the facts that the translation was not well done, the play was not well acted, and that one of the characters was no other than William Shakspeare. The introduction of Shakspeare in a play which has *Yorick* as its principal character gave a farcical turn to the drama, and injured it from the outset. The present translation or adaptation is by Mr. W. D. Howells, and it is unnecessary to say that he has enormously improved it. He has, in fact, made it just as good a play as it could possibly be made, and the credit of its present success is really due to him. The plot is an ingenious one, and possesses a genuine tragic interest. *Yorick*, the comedian of the Globe Theatre, is married to *Alice*, the leading lady of the company, who is much younger than her husband. *Alice* and *Yorick's* foster-son *Edmund*, who owes everything to *Yorick*, have fallen in love with each other, while *Walton*, the leading actor of the Globe, is jealous of *Yorick*, and determines to be revenged on

him by letting him know the condition of affairs between his wife and son. *Master Heywood*, the manager of the theatre, knows the unfortunate secret also, and endeavors to prevent *Yorick* from learning it. A play by *Master Woodford*, turning upon a precisely similar situation, gives the opportunity for the action. In *Master Woodford's* play, which is to be brought out at the Globe, the character of the jealous husband is taken by *Yorick*, that of the faithless wife by *Alice*, and that of the ungrateful ward by *Edmund*. *Walton* fills *Yorick's* mind with suspicions, and gradually, as the play within the play goes on, the truth comes out. A letter actually written by *Edmund* to *Alice* is substituted for a letter in the play and handed to *Yorick*, who reads it. The end is necessarily tragic, but the tragedy is not of that gloomy and morbid sort so common in the modern drama. We do not know whether it is owing to Mr. Howells or the Spanish author that the love-affair of *Edmund* and *Alice* is entirely innocent, but this is one of the great merits of the play. It is *Alice's* purity and the resistance of both the lovers to their unfortunate passion which make the play interesting. Of the acting that of Mr. Barrett is noticeable, as is always the case, for its refinement and intellectuality; that of Miss Wainwright, who takes the part of *Alice*, is strong throughout, though she has a tendency to overact. The part, however, is one of extreme difficulty. The small parts are all well taken, and altogether the play deserves to have, as it is having, a long run.

—The annual Christmas performance of Handel's "Messiah" attracted, both at the public rehearsal and at the concert, some of the largest audiences that have ever filled Steinway Hall. The work of the chorus was admirable. Dr. Damrosch produces effects of light and shade, even the most delicate crescendo and decrescendo, that are truly wonderful, considering that he has to control a body of more than three hundred voices. Some of the well-known numbers, such as "For unto us a Child is given," "All we like sheep," "Glory to God," and, above all, the "Hallelujah Chorus," were given with an effectiveness that roused the enthusiasm of the audience. The solo quartet was composed of distinguished artists, who were not, however, all equal to their task. Mr. Henschel, whose voice is hardly heavy enough for oratorio music, sang with such thoroughly artistic taste as to cause every minor defect to be readily overlooked. The bass is the most important solo part in the "Messiah," and Mr. Henschel did perfect justice to every number. Miss Bailey is, we believe, a pupil of Mr. Henschel's, and shows in every note the excellent training she has received. Her method closely resembles her accomplished master's, but her voice, though very sweet, is altogether too small for oratorio music. In many instances she could not be heard above Dr. Damrosch's orchestra. The same may be said of Mr. Toedt, who, at short notice, undertook the tenor part in place of Mr. Simpson. Mr. Toedt has a very agreeable voice, of Italian lyric quality, and sings with intelligence and taste, but he should confine himself to ballad music and never attempt oratorio, particularly in a large hall and with a large orchestra. Miss Drasdil has been heard for many years in the alto part, and her performance of it calls for no comment.

—The first of a series of chamber-music concerts, by Mr. and Mrs. Carl Feininger, which took place in Steinway Hall, introduced a new pianist, Mr. Louis Maas, who proved himself an artist of considerable attainments, but not superior in any respect to many performers of both sexes now living in this city. The string quartet consisted of Messrs. Feininger, Roebelen, Risch, and Mueller, who played Haydn's quartet in E flat, and afterwards took part with Mr. Maas in Rubinstein's B flat trio. Mrs. Feininger sang several songs with good taste, and Mr. Feininger played Back's Chaconne with faultless technique.

—The anonymous editor of an "Album of Songs, Old and New, by Robert Franz" (Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co.) has conferred an obligation on all who value vocal music of the lyric order, and who already do homage to the genius of this master or have yet to make his acquaintance. Such a setting as Franz has given to Geibel's "Im Herbst," Von Fallersleben's "Tanzlied im Mai," Müller's "Im Walde," and Körner's "Waldfahrt," to mention no others, can never fade from memory. In this rich collection no less than twenty-one of Heine's songs are vocalized, four of Burns's, two of "Mirza-Schaffy's," while Goethe, Tieck, Arndt, Chamisso, Lenau, and Rückert furnish numerous themes, without exhausting the list. Franz's compositions during the past two years have been excerpted from, and here appear for the first time in an American edition. In the 107 translations which accompany the German words there is, of course, a great choice, and never will it be possible in dealing with a language like the German to match its inversions with a word-for-word or even a phrase-for-phrase English equivalence, especially so long as rhyme is considered essential. The absurdities into which, in the case of easier languages, the translator is often plunged by this restraint, makes it seem singular that the fashion has not arisen of dispensing with everything except rhythm, and as much elegance of diction as can be preserved, in versions intended only to be sung and not read for their own sake as poetry. This would, we are sure, have greatly lightened the task of Mrs. Louise T. Craigin, who undertook all the versions of "A Book of Rhymes and Tunes," for

children largely, compiled by Margaret Pearmain Osgood (Boston: Ditson). The aim of this collection is laudable, and while not all the tunes are new even to the American nursery, a great many of them could be introduced to advantage. Three songs are from the French, the rest in greatest measure from the German, the original words being retained in both cases beside the version. It is not easy to explain the selection of two arrangements of Goethe's "Heidenröslein" for a work of this character. Surely Schubert's beautiful melody might have sufficed.

—As Mr. Henry G. Vennor has made himself notable, and also bears an official title, it may be worth while to make a systematic test of his pretences as a weather prophet. Such a test he furnishes the means of making, owing to the reckless definiteness of his ungrounded guesses. We quote from his Almanac for 1881 the following specific predictions, one for each month, which we propose to review twelve months hence: "Probabilities for January, 1881: . . . Blockades of snow in the United States about the 7th and 8th"; "mild spell from January 18 . . . to February 12"; "March 9 and 10 gales are probable around New York and Boston, and snow-storms." "In April will be a snow fall, on the 4th or 5th, but spring will be well advanced by the 15th." "In May, after the 10th, hot weather; on the 13th and 15th thunder-storms." "June . . . warm . . . till 11th, then cold till 20th; frosts on 22d and 23d; 24th to 26th hot." "July, cold on 13th, 25th, 23d, and 31st; hot on 4th, 5th, 9th, 11th, 16th, 17th, 25th, and 26th." "August 4th and 5th will be cold." In September the centre of the month will be its warmest part. October will open cold; November will be muddy, with little frost; December will be the warmest ever known. Mr. Vennor's derivation of September will surprise persons who know how to spell and decompose Latin words, "From septem, seven, and from umber, shower." We wonder why the names of November and December are not similarly suggestive?

—We note the reception of 'The Nautical Almanac and Astronomical Ephemeris for the Meridian of the Royal Observatory at Greenwich' at about the usual time. The volume for the year 1884 is just at hand, and is the fifty-first issue of this annual under the greatly improved form of composition and arrangement. If we compare the volume for 1884 with that for 1834, or any subsequent year, we shall remark no signal difference at a glance; and it is well worthy of note that the apparent lack of change and improvement during all this time is not due to any lack of progress in those branches of science connected with the making of almanacs, but to the fact that the Royal Astronomical Society's Committee, appointed in 1830 "to take into consideration the letter addressed to them by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, relative to the improvement of the Nautical Almanac," did their work so well. Such names as Airy, Babbage, J. F. W. Herschel, Pond, South, and Struve, in connection with their elaborate and painstaking "report," readily account for the circumstance that the form and arrangement of the 'Nautical Almanac and Astronomical Ephemeris' were, at that early date, so thoroughly digested that the great advances in astronomy during the last half-century have not required any very marked alteration. Of course the tools of the almanac-maker have been vastly improved, and the British Nautical Almanac office has kept even pace with these improvements, always adopting the most perfect tables of the celestial motions, by whomsoever constructed, while it has very seldom contributed directly to the improvement of these tables themselves. One of the most noticeable features in the construction of this 'Ephemeris' is that the positions of all the major planets are now derived from a uniform series of tables—those by the late Le Verrier. The ephemeris of the moon is computed from the 'Tables de la Lune' of Hansen, and the positions are greatly improved by the adoption of the corrections to these tables resulting from the researches of Professor Newcomb. The list of "Stars to be observed with Mars at opposition"—a list compiled to facilitate observations of the declination of Mars for determining the solar parallax—is continued, although the method may almost be said to be antiquated, and no astronomer would think of employing it except in default of the conveniences for making a series of observations in accordance with the new and more accurate methods.

—It is gratifying to observe the improvements in our own 'Astronomical Ephemeris' instituted by the present Superintendent, Professor Newcomb. The volume for the year 1883, recently published, embodies all these changes, which have been introduced with great advantage. All astronomers engaged in original research will appreciate the introduction of the heliocentric co-ordinates of the major planets, which have been conveniently accessible heretofore in the British 'Ephemeris' only. But it is a matter of much regret that the positions of two or three of the major planets are computed from such imperfect tables. Most astronomers will find the data for identifying the satellites of the outer planets much to their fancy—in fact, these data are not to be found published regularly elsewhere. The great increase in the list of fixed stars, and in the accuracy of their positions, is a conspicuous feature of the improved 'Ephemeris,' and in this regard it is much in advance of the almanacs of other nations. The lunar ephemeris being computed from precisely the same fundamental data as are used in the British

Nautical Almanac, is so essentially a duplicate thereof that it seems a pity that no international agreement should be concluded whereby the labor of this computation might be divided in so far as duplication is unnecessary for accuracy. We may almost venture the assertion that the greatest advance of the next half-century of almanac-making will consist in the economy of computation resulting from international division of the work of preparing ephemerides. An enormous mass of computation might thereby be avoided which is now little short of useless. This preorganized system has long been in vogue in certain classes of astronomical work executed at foreign observatories, and there is no reason why its introduction in the preparation of astronomical ephemerides should be attended with serious difficulty.

—The Archæological Institute of America has, it appears, decided upon the exploration of the ancient Assus as its first great task upon classic ground, having already commenced investigating the native antiquities of New Mexico and the valley of the Rio Grande. The official permission of the Turkish Government necessary for a survey and excavations at the modern Bayram was received during the past month, having been secured through the interest of the Department of State at Washington to assist a work undertaken by Americans solely for the advancement of knowledge. Upon the whole, the choice of site appears fortunate. Assus, the chief city of the Troad, one of the most flourishing colonies of the Greek race upon the seaboard of Asia Minor, attained its greatest extent in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. with the development of Hellenic art, being fortunately deserted before the spread of the Christian faith, and not dying of old age like Ephesus and Corinth. Its theatre, temple, cemeteries, and especially its extensive fortifications, are so well preserved that the first English authority upon the subject of Greek topography, Col. Leake, asserted that the ruins give the most perfect obtainable idea of a Greek city, a judgment confirmed by every subsequent visitor. And yet, with the exception of six notoriously untrustworthy plates in Texier's 'Description de l'Asie Mineure,' Assus is wholly "inedited." Though guesses are of no great value, it may be assumed that no great booty of sculptures, treasures of precious metals, or even inscriptions, will be found. The dry soil of the exposed cliff is scanty, and mediæval lime-burners under the Genoese rule have thoroughly destroyed the marble once upon the plateau. Direct results of interest and importance are to be accomplished by surveys and restorations of the disposition and principal buildings of the city, as well as by the solution of vexed archæological problems. A careful geological investigation of that part of the Troad is to be placed in charge of experts, and this promises to be of independent value, as the country is volcanic and contains salt lakes of peculiar formation. These gains are certain, and they by no means preclude important discoveries during the projected excavations. The situation of the city in Turkish territory renders it possible to secure a part of any works of sculpture or pottery that may be found, the exportation of antiques not being subjected there to such inflexible laws as have been enforced upon explorers in Greece proper, and even in semi-independent Samos. The gentlemen to whom the prosecution of the work has been entrusted, having been selected from a great number of applicants, may be presumed to be well qualified in their various branches. The staff of six consists of four architects, engineers, and draughtsmen, and two philological and archæological scholars, and besides the regular staff there will be two assistants, one a geologist and one to whom the province of collecting the flora and fauna of the region has been assigned. The technical element wisely predominates, for the work of systematic excavation is not one for which archæologists are particularly adapted by their collegiate training. Inscriptions, fragments of statues and reliefs, vases and the domestic utensils of antique life, everything of direct interest to the classical scholar that may be discovered, will be transported from the site to Stamboul or this country, and when published can be discussed and illustrated by the specialists of Europe and America at their ease. But it is otherwise with the terraces, aqueducts, and general arrangement of the city, and with the remains of architectural monuments, which at Assus are of particular importance, and which the restorer must work up on the spot. It is proposed to commence the topographical survey and the excavation of the Acropolis in March, and to continue work throughout the summer, regardless of the heat and the stifling dust whirled into the air by the Etesian winds. How far this inversion of the usual campaign of classical expeditions will succeed remains to be seen. Investigations at Delos have been carried out in the dry season, and the climate of Assus, rising as the city does directly from the Gulf of Adramyttium, may not be more extreme.

—The latest publications of the English Dialect Society are three in Series C—Original Glossaries, and one in Series D—Miscellaneous (Trübner & Co.) The last consists merely of an early English hymn to the Virgin, with a Welsh phonetic transcription which Mr. A. J. Ellis assigns to the end of the 15th or beginning of the 16th century, both copied from MSS. of the Hengwrt Collection. Mr. Ellis furnishes the key to the Welsh vowel and consonant values of that period, and consequently to the true pronunciation of the English original. Of the glossaries perhaps that of "Words in Use

in the Counties of Antrim and Down" has the greatest present interest, on account of the introduction, which describes the overrunning of Ulster by English, Scotch, and Welsh immigrants at a time (the beginning of the 17th century) when Ireland was Australia, Canada, or the United States to such of the inhabitants of Great Britain as sought to better their condition by going abroad. Canon Hume, defining the district settled by the English as extending from tide-water on both sides of Belfast Lough to Lough Neagh and into Tyrone, says it "is still that of the apple, the elm, and the sycamore—of large farms and two-storied slate houses." The Scotch entered to north and to south by way of the Giant's Causeway and Donaghadee, and Mr. Patterson's glossary is chiefly derived from them. The proverbs given on p. viii., and such phrases as "back talk," "cold comfort," "dear knows," "God's truth," "hear tell," etc., have a very familiar sound to American ears. The use of the Irish language in Antrim and Down is now comparatively restricted, and those who speak it can almost invariably speak English also. The glossary of "Words in Use in Cornwall, East and West," is curious for the difference between the sections. The transpositions of *s* and *p*, as in *claps* for *clasp*, in the West, is paralleled by the transposition of *r*, as in *apern* for *apron*, *afeard* for *afraid*, *girts* for *groats*, in the East. Mr. Couch, who edits the latter glossary, supplies numerous instances of the employment of these provincial words in classic English literature. In both sections *faggot*, besides designating a bad woman, is applied to what in our American slang is calling "selling out," in games of skill, physical contests, and the like. Mr. Couch adds: "I presume it has some relationship to the word in use among electioneering people, *faggot vote*." Miss Courtney quotes among others a West Cornish proverb: "So drunk that he couldn't see a hole in a nine-rung ladder." Both these and the Ulster glossaries are rich in nursery rhymes, children's games and formulas, and popular sayings and customs, not a few of which are far from being strange to this side of the Atlantic. In Mr. Britten's "Old Country and Farming Words," gleaned from agricultural books, perhaps the most remarkable feature is the great number of names to designate growing animals according to sex and successive ages. This seems to be as much a mark of a primitive civilization as the refinements in the early nomenclature of consanguinity. Curious also are the terms used in directing horses in Scotland, Yorkshire, Cheshire, Gloucestershire, Kent, and Hants, of which a comparative table is given on p. 148. The Kentish horse, addressed with *woot* (right), *woi* (left), *woa* (stop), certainly needed the most delicate ear. We recommend our friends of the Metric Bureau to make a tract out of the articles on weights and measures prevailing in different counties, e.g., bushel, perch, pound, and stone. We can cite only the happy uniformity in South Wales, where a *stone* signified "of wool, 14 lbs., with 1 lb. ingrain, making 15 lbs. when sold to woolstaplers. In various markets, provincial weights of 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, and 26 lbs.; of butcher's meat, commonly 12 lbs."

—The German papers have a good deal to say about the late Karl Heinzen, who died in Boston on the 12th of November last. Though he spent half his life in this country, he was never reconciled to the form of government, his objection being to the Presidential office, which he regarded as a disguised throne, and for the holder of which he invented the epigrammatic definition of "a king in a dress-coat." He was born in 1809, enlisted in the Dutch army and served in Java, and became generally known in 1844 by a pamphlet on the Prussian bureaucracy, which brought upon him a prosecution that forced him to flee the country. He came to the United States, whence he returned in 1848 to take part in the Baden insurrection. He was one of the best haters of the age, including in his black list all priests, all princes, all soldiers, and nearly all German-American editors. His journal, *Der Pionier*, started in 1854 at Louisville, and continued up to the time of his death in Boston, was the medium of his radicalism, which was Puritanic in its severity and want of humor. His opinion of his countryfolk at home may be inferred from the sarcastically earnest national song which he wrote for them, and whose opening lines run thus: "O wenn ich doch ein Wallfisch wär, und lauter Lagerbier das Meer." In his later years he was a hearty advocate of woman suffrage. Mr. Heinzen possessed a commanding figure, and his expression was perhaps rather stern than grave. He never acquired much mastery of the English language, at least for the purposes of conversation.

SCHUMANN'S MUSIC AND MUSICIANS.*

It argues well for the rapid increase of an interest in musical matters in this country that the first volume of Mrs. Ritter's translation of Schumann's essays, which was favorably noticed in these columns about three years ago, has in this short time reached the same number of editions as the original German edition in twenty-five years. We may partly account for this by the fact that the Germans are more of a book-writing and a book-reading than a book-buying nation, circulating libraries being greatly in vogue among them.

But much of the success of the American edition is due to the excellence of its execution and the scarcity of good books on musical topics in the English language. Within the last few years partial translations have appeared of the works of Berlioz, Wagner, and Schumann, and we fancy we are not altogether mistaken in the notion that, in connection with Grove's 'Dictionary of Music and Musicians,' these translations have contributed somewhat towards raising the standard of musical criticism and discussion in this country, and in creating a demand for an impartial musical journal conducted on purely artistic principles, such as we now have in the *Musical Review*.

Publishers are never less accessible than when they are approached by translators, for which they are hardly to blame, as translations of books that do not belong to the class of fiction seldom cover the cost of publication. Fortunately, the first volume of the essays of Schumann proved an exception, and to this we owe the appearance of a second volume containing the remainder of the essays. As it was at first uncertain whether a second volume would be called for, the arrangement of the articles has been altered from that adopted in the German edition. But this, except to a historian, is a matter of no consequence, as the essays are not systematically connected, being mere reprints of his critical articles written during his editorship of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*. The plan adopted in the present volume has been to arrange the various articles according to topics, such as opera, oratorio, symphonies, songs, chamber-music, pianoforte studies, etc. On first opening the book the reader is apt to be disappointed at seeing so many criticisms of composers who are now completely forgotten and whose names in many cases are not even recorded in musical dictionaries, though here preserved, as it were, in amber. But he will soon find that this makes the articles in question hardly less interesting than those which discuss new works by famous composers. In the most unexpected place, perhaps in discussing a short piece by a young beginner, Schumann casually throws out a hint that would furnish material for a long-winded chapter in some systematic treatise on aesthetics; and we must confess that we should invariably prefer the hint to the long-winded chapter.

Schumann's notorious enthusiasm for the works of Jean Paul fortunately did not go so far as to make him affect to any extent the unnatural and most clumsy style of that writer, the Kant among novelists. His own style is not brilliant and his humor is apt to be a trifle naïve, but he is always clear and forcible and, above all, he has the gift, which few musical or other critics possess, of always putting the right adjective in the right place. It is so difficult to write about musical compositions, and the number of words or epithets available is so limited, that the ordinary critic has a habit of putting down the first convenient adjective that presents itself to his mind. It is not unlikely that a good part of the discrepancies so noticeable in musical criticisms of the same work or performance are due to this cause. In this respect critics can learn much of Schumann. As to the matter and drift of his criticisms, little need be added to what we have observed on a previous occasion. The most conspicuous fault is, perhaps, a too favorable and hopeful estimate of mediocrity, and in this respect Schumann occupies the opposite pole to that represented by Wagner. In two things, indeed, they were in perfect accord—in their condemnation of Italian opera and their abhorrence of Meyerbeer; but, in general, their aims and views took different directions. Altogether too much importance was attached to the appearance, a year ago, of the article on Schumann by Wagner's friend, Julius Rubinstein. Wagner's views on Schumann had been expressed many years before, and they were no less unfavorable than some of the remarks made by Schumann about Wagner. The affair is simply another illustration of the old antagonism between the dramatic and the lyric composers, which recurs throughout the history of music. Wagner's dramatic genius led him to admire chiefly Gluck, Weber, Mozart, and Beethoven, while Schumann's lyric and epic genius revelled in the works of Mendelssohn and kindred composers. It is not strange, accordingly, that Wagner was not one of the composers whom Schumann "discovered." The three composers whom he did discover—at least for Germany—were Chopin, Berlioz, and Brahms; and this constitutes, perhaps, his greatest literary or critical achievement. In regard to Chopin, the world has seen fit to endorse every word of praise Schumann bestowed on him and to add many new superlatives. Of Berlioz, Schumann says (p. 70): "We beseech posterity to bear us witness that we never waited ten years, in critical wisdom, to review the compositions of Berlioz, but that we have always said that in this Frenchman's brain burns the flame of genius." The musical world is not so unanimous in recognizing the genius of Berlioz as that of Chopin. In Germany Berlioz remains still the most neglected of all modern composers, but in France, and to a less extent in America, he has for the last two years played the rôle of a newly imported lion, which we hope he may maintain until all have had fair opportunity to satisfy themselves whether he really belongs to the list of immortals.

If Berlioz is still under a cloud, still more so is Schumann's third protégé, Johannes Brahms. We all know in what pompous and hyperbolic manner Brahms was announced as the heaven-born genius who was to give the fullest and most complete expression to the ideas of his time, and to afford us all a

* 'Music and Musicians, Essays and Criticisms.' By Robert Schumann. Translated, edited, and annotated by Fanny Raymond Ritter. Second series. New York: E. Schuberth & Co. 1880. Pp. 540.

wonderful view of the secrets of the spiritual world. The affinities between the two composers may excuse the tone of this prophecy. That it has failed of realization is now no longer a matter for debate. The vocal and instrumental compositions of Brahms contain many interesting and often charming ideas, always elaborated with great skill. But Brahms's work as a whole is less the work of genius than of great industry aided by talent. It reminds one of the very complete and well-arranged scientific and historical textbooks the Germans produce in such abundance, but which seldom extend the boundaries of their science. When, some years ago, Brahms was first introduced in this country on a grand scale by his first symphony, there was great excitement; but, unless we are greatly mistaken, this excitement has entirely subsided at present, and is not likely to be revived. On European concert programmes the name of Brahms is not frequent except in the concerts of the Berlin Academy of Music, which is under the direction of Brahms's friend, Joachim. It is interesting to watch the expression of amateurs when they listen to Brahms. They feel that what they hear is not commonplace, that the instrumentation is fine, the themes clear and systematically treated; and yet there is a certain want of clearness and tangibility in the whole that to most people is quite puzzling. It is a metaphysical, a sort of Hegelian music, which, to borrow a phrase of Schopenhauer's, induces many to ask whether there are really no tangible ideas in this work, or whether they alone are too stupid to see them. A view of Brahms similar to the one here taken is set forth by Louis Köhler in an interesting pamphlet on 'Johannes Brahms und seine Stellung in der Musikgeschichte' (Hanover: Simon, 1889). His view of Brahms is that he is a sort of connecting link between the early Schumann and the late Beethoven, instead of being, as the ultra-Brahmsites imagine, the giant who stands on the shoulders of both Schumann and Beethoven. In regard to Schumann's prophecy about Brahms as the coming man Köhler makes the following remarks, which we can fully endorse:

"The first genius of the period could not again be a Beethoven of instrumental music, but one who should directly unite the newly gained instrumental acquisitions with dramatic poetry and utilize them in the music-drama. This is now no longer an individual assertion but an actual fact, which stands clear as the sun in the firmament and illumines the whole horizon of the musical world of to-day. For of whom among all the great musicians, nay, of the masters of any of the arts, can it be affirmed that he created a new world within this world—Brahms or Wagner? Whether this new world be agreeable or disagreeable to this or that man does not concern us here. That may remain a matter of dispute; the fact itself cannot be disputed."

By way of appendix we may add that Breitkopf & Haertel, of Leipzig, are publishing Liszt's collected articles on musical subjects in five volumes, one of which has already appeared. A translation of these essays would be as sure of success as those of Schumann, and we hope Mrs. Ritter, or some one, equally qualified for the task, may find time and inclination to undertake it. Human nature is here the same as in other matters; the more one gets of a good thing the more one wants.

THE LATEST WORD ON THE VENUS OF MILO.*

FOR all artists, poets, and lovers of the beautiful the Venus of Melos, aptly called by Heine "Our Lady of Beauty," remains the most extensively worshipped goddess. Her dominion lasts through long centuries which have brought utter change in religion, nationalities, and all that men hold most important. Her power is as great now as when she was first created, and where can we find so imposing a type of womanhood, such perfection of dignity and beauty combined? These irresistible charms are enhanced by a mystery and suggestiveness which lend her an unique attraction; and while artists seek to discover how her arms would be placed and what she may be doing with them, archæologists lose themselves in theories as to her creator, her destination, and her meaning.

The work of Dr. Goeler von Ravensburg takes the form of an artistic and historical monograph on the Venus of Milo, and contains all the matter of fact known on the subject, with a great deal of fancy displayed in the restoration which he advocates and of which he subjoins a photograph. The view Dr. von Ravensburg accepts as the only satisfactory solution of the question is one advanced and carried out in plaster by an English doctor and art student residing in Paris, Claudius Tarral. This gentleman has been studying the statue for the last twenty years, and in 1861 published a letter to the *Spectator* on the subject, describing the result of his investigations. According to the photograph of his restoration, the goddess would be holding in her upraised right hand an apple, symbol of her victory, and with her left would be lightly touching her falling drapery; a Hermes stands on her left. The geography and history of the island of Melos (*Mήλος*), with a description of the place, occupy the first chapter of the book. Thucydides mentions the island as containing ten thousand souls, far beyond the number of its present population. It was evidently never of any great importance, although it con-

sisted of several small towns or villages besides its chief town, Melos. The historic and chronological data are scanty enough. The first inhabitants of Melos were Phœnicians; the island was afterwards colonized by Laconians, who founded a Doric state there, thus causing it to differ from the other Cyclades, which were all Ionian. The Athenians, flouting the possession of the island indispensable to their dominion of the sea, conquered Melos in 416 B.C., notwithstanding vigorous resistance. The entire adult male population having been put to the sword, the Athenians repopulated Melos with five hundred Attic colonists. These were driven out again by Lysander in 404, and after this definite victory of the Spartans the island was given over to the remains of its former population, but its political importance was at an end for ever.

In Roman times we find a Greek theatre being built there, and already in the third century a large Christian community, of which the catacombs are still to be seen. After the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders Melos formed part of the dukedom of Naxos. In modern times we hear absolutely nothing of it till the finding of the statue. On the 8th of April, in the year 1820, according to the account of Von Ravensburg, a Greek peasant was digging in his field, situated about five hundred paces distant from the ruins of the theatre, near the old walls of the city. He suddenly came upon part of the old wall and then on some hewn stones, which are considered valuable for building, so went on digging till he came to a grotto from four to five metres wide which had formerly been a tomb. Therein he found the statue, or probably only the upper part, along with two or three Hermæ and some marble fragments. Two of the official letters on the subject would go far to prove that the lower part of the statue was not found till four days or perhaps a week later. Nothing indicates that the grotto in which the Venus was found had ever been a temple or crypt, as some pretend, the field being exactly over the tombs. (Dr. von Ravensburg seems here to be lacking in knowledge of the locality, as in the documents relating to the finding of the statue there is no mention made of any tomb, and Mr. W. J. Stillman, visiting the spot in 1866, describes not a grotto but a niche apparently built for the purpose of concealing the statue. Furthermore, the place of concealment was within the limits of the city and entirely separated from the localities devoted to interment.)

The peasant at once announced his discovery to the French consular agent, M. Louis Brest, who advised him to place the statue in safety. Accordingly, sheltering it in a stable, he continued his excavations in the grotto, and found some days later the lower half of the statue and fragments of other antiques—among them a right hand, a left hand holding an apple (?), a portion of the upper part of the left arm, and a chignon; besides these a block of marble with a dedicatory inscription (which, according to Dumont d'Urville, was above the entrance to the grotto), and quite near the spot a left foot clothed with a cothurnus. Nothing can be more conflicting than the early documents on the discovery of the statue, which are all given in the book; each statement varies from all others, and none seems quite trustworthy. Some accounts are evidently based on mere hearsay, and it is easy to understand how the worthy peasant would vary his narrative for each fresh listener, unconsciously, perhaps, but just enough to confuse the matter. Brest in his first letter says: "Les bras sont cassés"; on the strength of which some suppose the arms to have been attached to the statue when found, although there is nothing in any account to suggest this, and in a later letter of Brest (November 26) he alludes to the Marquis de Rivière, then French ambassador at Constantinople, having commissioned him to institute a search for the arms of the statue in the grotto where they found her. This would show that the arms had not been discovered up to that moment.

Brest recommended the acquisition of the statue by his Government, and acted with considerable energy, though from his ignorance of the importance of the find he would not run the risk of buying it at once. After the usual official formalities and delays had been gone through, and several French officers had seen and reported on the statue, the Comte de Marcellus, Secretary of the French Legation, was sent to carry off the Venus on board the *Estafette*. He arrived just in time to save her from being shipped off on a brig bearing the Turkish flag, as a present or bribe from a dishonest priest to the dragoman of the arsenal at Constantinople. The brig was detained at Melos by unfavorable winds, and Marcellus by energetic argument induced the priest to persuade the priest to cancel his purchase of the statue. Marcellus paid about 550 francs for the statue. The pieces he took were nine—the two halves of the statue, the chignon, the arm fragment, the hand holding an apple, besides three Hermæ, and a left foot. These Hermæ, which were found in the same grotto as the statue, have given rise to several misunderstandings, as in the official accounts they sometimes are mentioned as Hermæ, and in another place as a statue of the god Hermes. They are of small size, the smallest representing Mercury, another the young Hercules, and the third the Indian Bacchus. They are supposed to have served as boundary marks. The inscription was left behind, Marcellus being evidently of opinion that it had no connection with the statue. The letters were nearly all complete, and it ran thus: "Alexander (or Agesander), son of Menides

* 'Die Venus von Milo. Eine Kunstgeschichtliche Monographie, von Friedr. Frhrn. Goeler von Ravensburg, Dr. Philos.' Heidelberg, 1879.

of Antioch, made this for Menander." Artists used thus to sign their work. The character of the letters showed that the inscription belonged to the last century before Christ, and would thus prove to archaeologists that it did not relate to the Venus. The block of marble with the dedicatory inscription, which, according to Dumont d'Urville, was above the entrance to the grotto, ran thus: "Bakchios, the son of Satias, during the time of his undergymnasiumship, built an exedra to Hermes and Heracles, and . . ." These characters are also of the last century B.C. Nothing proves that this referred to the grotto, though it might have related to the Hermæ of Mercury and Hercules found therein. This block of marble was at one time in the storehouse of the Louvre, but has now disappeared; a drawing of it remains.

The Venus of Melos was placed in the Louvre in 1821, nearly a year after her discovery, and was presented as a gift to Louis XVIII. by the Marquis de Rivière. Attempts to restore her arms were so unsatisfactory that the King decided she should be placed without arms in the national collection. The Bavarian Government tried to lay claim to the treasure on the strength of Louis I. of Bavaria having bought the site of the amphitheatre in Melos, but this claim was dropped after a little diplomatic correspondence, and the assurance that the field in which the Venus was found was at some distance from the theatre. The goddess remained undisturbed till the Germans bombarded Paris in 1870, when she was deposited in an oaken chest in the cellars of the Prefecture of Police. The Prefecture was burnt, but the statue was not injured, and she returned to her former position in the Louvre in June, 1871.

The Comte de Clarac, curator of the Louvre antiques at the time the Venus and the fragments arrived, says, reporting on them, "La partie du bras gauche que l'on a retrouvée a certainement appartenu à l'origine à notre statue." Of the hand he says: "Le marbre de ce fragment est absolument le même que celui de la statue." Monsieur Bernard Lange, a sculptor, is of the same opinion. The fragments did not long satisfy the ardor of the theorists, and were consigned to the Louvre store-room. Tarral brought them forward again in 1860, as also the Herma of Mercury, and used them for his restoration, which he had carried out in plaster that all might judge of it. Froehner, who again subjected the fragments to the most minute investigation in 1865, was convinced they were of the same marble as the statue, and pronounced Tarral's version of the Venus holding aloft an apple as "un résultat désormais inattaquable." As a plea for the inferiority of workmanship in these fragments he says the hands and feet of antique statues were often of later date than the rest! Froehner also found that the proportions of the fragments agreed exactly with those of the statue. Longpérier, Otfried Müller, Friederichs, Kinkel, and Preuner all accept the fragments as belonging to the statue. Others, in favor of another theory, Ravaissou and Valentin, for instance, say they might have subsequently belonged to the statue but not originally; they may date from some antique restoration which changed the first action of the arms. The fragments found with the statue are so imperfect and corroded that it is impossible to judge of what they might have been, and it has been considered that the apple was really a cup; judging from the photograph given in this work, they seem very different in character from the statue. Von Ravensburg divides the restoration theories into two classes: the first seeing in the statue part of a group, and the second taking it as a single figure.

Of the theories in favor of a group Quatremère de Quincy's was the first. He supposed the goddess to have her raised left hand on the shoulder of Mars, while with the right she would be entreating him to lay down his arms. He urges the want of finish of the drapery on the left side as an argument in favor of a figure standing beside her. Von Ravensburg objects to this that many chefs-d'œuvre show slightness of handling in unimportant parts not meant to be seen, either from their position or the light in the temple they were intended for; he especially cites the Hermes of Olympia, a work of Praxiteles, to illustrate his meaning. Ravaissou advances another variation of this group, and looks upon the Melian statue as a replica of a more ancient work, in which Venus is represented as the bride emerging from the bath. He names the Mars Borghese of the Louvre as her companion figure, and, as this is smaller in size than our Venus, he supposes the Melian goddess to be a replica; he is satisfied with the same pose as De Quincy. V. Valentin, of Frankfurt, has published a volume on this subject, and supposes the Venus to be with the left hand repelling the advances of a lover, while with her right she is holding her falling drapery. He thinks this would exactly explain the position of the body and that of the drapery. Von Ravensburg indicates the dignified calm expressed in the face as sufficient objection. Geskel Saloman, a sculptor, sees in the Melian statue one of a group whose subject was the well-known fable of "Hercules at the cross-roads." A young Hercules was represented between the goddess of youth, fully draped, and the goddess of pleasure holding a goblet or flowers in her right hand and an apple in her left; this latter figure would be the Melian. Saloman bases this theory on a whole network of hypotheses. He insists that the place in which the statue was found was an ancient gymnasium, and points to the inscription of Bakchios in support of this.

The theorists in favor of the single figure see, some of them, a Venus Victrix holding in her hands the symbol of her victory—either an apple, a shield, or a lance. The restoration representing the goddess holding a shield with both hands was first suggested by the English archaeologist Millingen in 1826. Among the adherents of this view were Welcker, O. Jahn, Wittich, E. Braun, V. Rydberg, and even Clarac, at first in favor of the apple restoration. O. Müller adopted this latter when he had seen the fragments, but the shield restoration had the greater number of adherents till Froehner and Tarral brought the apple restoration to more general recognition. Millingen's starting point was the analogy of the statue to the Capuan Venus and the position of the body of the Melian statue. He is strengthened in this hypothesis by similar compositions on Corinthian coins and a description in Apollonius of Rhodes of an Aphrodite holding the shield of Mars, in which she is mirrored. Millingen supposed her to be holding out the shield, while others think it was resting on the left knee. Against this view, which seems to us to be far more probable than any of the former, Von Ravensburg very vehemently protests, as strongly as he does against the hypothetical groups, not even admitting that it would particularly explain the movement of the figure and the action of the left leg. He objects, from an æsthetic point of view, to supposing the goddess bending under the weight of a burden, or battling with any physical effort. He even asserts that all goddesses bearing shields either stand up straight or bend forward, but never hold back, and as examples cites the Capuan Venus and the Victory of Brescia (which seems to us especially to support the contrary argument, and to be only replicas of far later date, from memory, of the Melian statue). Rydberg's version makes her hold a large shield with the inscription towards the spectator narrating the victory of the Greeks over the Persians. Von Ravensburg objects that the shield would hide the best view of the body (which is not at all necessary), and again that the goddess is looking out afar above anything of the kind. These reasons seem to have staggered Professor Wittig, who had carried out the shield restoration.

All our author's power of rhetoric is employed in favor of the Venus holding-the-apple theory. He finds endless reasons for supporting this, as the only satisfactory solution, the apple being the symbol of love, symbol of fruitfulness, and the symbol of the island (*Mēlos*). He sees in the whole movement of the figure consciousness of victory, which accounts for the especial action in every detail, and he dwells at great length on every point, repeating himself so frequently that he must hope through great weariness to gain a convert. He attributes the striking effect of the statue to the variety in unity combined, which he considers a most important quality in all art. We can only say that with Dr. Tarral's arms and the Mercury Herma at the side we no longer recognize the goddess. Dr. Tarral has also added the basis fragment with the inscription, and therefore supposes the Venus to be the work of Agesandros; he furthermore sees in him the author of the Laokoön group, as he finds great similarity between the two works, and fixes the period at the last century B.C. This alone would show Dr. Tarral to be singularly wanting in artistic perception. Dr. von Ravensburg, partisan as he is, cannot accept the anachronism, and ascribes the Venus to Skopas, in the period between 415 and 405 B.C. His reasons for so exactly fixing the decade are very plausible, and here most competent archaeologists agree with him. The book contains a list and description of supposed replicas of the statue, the official documents relating to the discovery, and a complete list of published works on the subject. Its greatest value consists in its being a *résumé*.

RECENT NOVELS.*

THE initial volume of the new Leisure-Hour Series is of inauspicious quality, which is of less moment than the inferiority of the garb it wears to the familiar "linen-duster" cover that was not only in excellent taste itself but has agreeable literary associations. The theme of 'A Dreamer' was more strongly treated in Mr. Julian Hawthorne's 'Sebastian Strome,' we remember, though that was, upon the whole, a weak book. The hero is a man who accepts what is conventionally termed defeat rather than be suffocated by conventional success. He is so sure the latter wouldn't suit him that there is not much merit in his foregoing it, and when he leads one friend to ruin and betrays another by stealing his betrothed's affections, his heroic proportions sensibly dwindle, to the unprejudiced sense of the reader. The author, however, is partial, and has in general rather singular taste. For example:

"'Christ had only to die. I could do that, I think,' replied Philip dreamily.

"'No, Mr. Temple,' interposed Griselda's gentle, earnest voice. 'He had to live first, just as we have.'

"'He had easy work.'

"'Yes; he went about helping people, and had always friends with him. But perhaps it was not always easy to him. Think of thirty years in a carpenter's shop when he wanted to be out in the world doing something.'"

* 'A Dreamer. By Katherine Wyld.' (Leisure-Hour Series.) New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1880.

This is, perhaps, nearly matched by the following, which concerns a different field of thought:

"Color is always a delusion. It does not reside in the object; it is not even in your eyes. It is in the very inside of you, in the innermost soul of your brain."

We can find no better way of characterizing 'Kate Comerford,' also, than by a quotation:

"I often think," said Mrs. Ashbur dreamily, 'the manner in which fame is portioned out to writers of fiction is anything but fair. The writer of 'Jane Eyre'—a genius, doubtless—is placed on a pedestal far above Miss Yonge, it seems; but for my part, rank heresy though it may be deemed, I should rather be known as the author of 'The Chaplet of Pearls' or 'The Dove in the Eagle's Nest' than to have written 'Jane Eyre' or 'Shirley.'"

Meantime, it may be remarked dreamily, the creator of Mrs. Ashbur will be known as the author of 'Kate Comerford' until she has corrected the impression that this kind of criticism is "rank heresy."

'As Thyself' is so persistently mysterious that it is but ordinary consideration to say at once that the plot can be understood only by reading the dénouement first. Ignoring the subsidiary mysteries involving the wicked guardian, the treacherous rival, the tempted doctor with his heart-broken wife, the self-sacrificing and unsuccessful lover, the reader will be free to track the winding paths of those two devoted brothers who, from love for each other and general principles of self-sacrifice, appear and disappear—in one city the elder being the reputed father of the heroine and in another the step-father of the hero, while the younger is the guardian of the hero and the father of the heroine. Besides these two rôles, they each assume also that of a dead man, the elder making so successful a ghost that the heroine narrowly escapes insanity. But when affairs are in the gloomiest condition the brothers resume their proper characters, and deprecatingly receive the eulogies showered upon them by appreciative friends in the midst of the wedding joys of the hero and his bride, at last united. A good illustration of the way in which the author's mind works is afforded by the following sentence: the heroine's sanity is doubted because of this among other family eccentricities, viz., that "Colonel and Mrs. Chevallier, while inmates of the same home and appearing in all outward amity, should have been irrevocably estranged without the sanction of a divorce." The style, it is curious to observe, is a sententiousness of the author's own, dashed with reminiscences of Rhoda Broughton's.

The oddest compound that we have met with for a long time, however, is to be seen in 'The Head of Medusa,' as any one will find natural when we mention that in it alternate reflections of Mr. Henry James, jr., and "Ouida" contend for preponderance. "Ouida" is successful at last, and premonitions of her triumph are afforded throughout in the evident bent of the author's faculties, but there is a marked mixture of the two which no one can mistake. To convey the notion that "George Fleming" is a novelist of no originality would, nevertheless, be an error. She has, it may be said, an original manner of echoing the external characteristics of her model, and has the air of going about it with great deliberateness. To commend her example to the many other novelists of the same intellectual fibre but less cleverness would be to harden their hearts when they need above all things to be born again, but it cannot be denied that there is much cleverness to be noticed in 'The Head of Medusa.' Its defect consists in being misapplied. In short, "George Fleming" represents very perfectly a new type of writers who may be called amateur novelists, using the adjective in both its senses, and implying an entirely different order of writers from those who produce "trash," as trash has hitherto been understood. The type is interesting, and its dissection not too clearly morbid anatomy; and it should be delivered into the hands of Mr. James not only because he is an expert in examinations of the kind, but because he is in great measure the cause, responsible or not, of its existence. "George Fleming" herself would enjoy the result more keenly than any one, probably, owing to her evidently quick appreciation. She has herself the critical faculty—not the habit, perhaps, but the power of observation—and in describing Mr. Clifford Dix (who characterizes Boston as "the literary junk-shop of England") has enumerated with admirable dispassionateness a number of interesting characteristics which it is announced are designed to compose a portrait of Mr. James. If this be true, it is obvious that she finds this writer lacking in some essential respects. He has a light touch, a keen sense, a graceful turn for epigrams, and so on; but he lacks an exalted seriousness, and is too fond of skimming the surface and leaving the depths untroubled. In fine, he needs to be supplemented by "Ouida." Mr. Lexetér meets the heroine, Barbara, "under the great shadow of the Pantheon" (the scene of 'The Head of Medusa' is Rome), and, after asking her with audacious jauntiness, "Are you too old a Roman to come in?" receives the reply, almost a reproof under the circumstances, "Is it not rather a sign of stupidity to grow accustomed to great things?" Mr. Lexetér

is an Englishman, and has known Barbara a great while, but upon the reader such a remark makes an impression; he perceives in it the key to the only problem connected with 'The Head of Medusa' which interests and perplexes him—"George Fleming," namely. She is never guilty of the stupidity in question, and all things affect her so gravely that it seems now and then as if it would be a relief to have her grow accustomed to a few great things, such as the Campagna landscape, a moonlight night, the untimely demise of marital affection, etc. Her sense of the importance of these things is made to atone for the absence of plot, characters, incident, or situation in 'The Head of Medusa,' but it is insisted on too exclusively and is too compatible with such an order of purely worldly wisdom as "that pity which, after five-and-twenty, is perhaps the predominant passion of really imaginative natures." A writer of this kind, who nevertheless shows on every page evidences of a cultivated taste, an almost fastidious precision in language, and some acquaintance with the world, cannot fail to interest a really imaginative reader, at all events.

The author of 'Adam and Eve' seeks for none of these things, and to mention her in connection with so entirely modern a competitor seems almost unfair. But in novels even of the ephemeral sort the qualities which in the long run most attract the reader are simplicity, genuineness, and absorption in the narrative and personages to the exclusion of more brilliant traits. 'Adam and Eve' is unaffected to the point of ingenuousness, and belongs unmistakably to the old-fashioned order of novels of, say, the third class—the class upon which a good deal of good literary work is expended without consciousness of unwise wastefulness, and which has the power to entertain without exciting any special gratitude or curiosity as to the author of the amusement. Eve and her mother live in decent poverty in London—it is needless to observe that the book is English. Robert, a young watchmaker, is in love with Eve, and after the death of her mother tries to persuade her to remain with him instead of going to her paternal uncle in Cornwall. She has imagination, however, and high spirits, and Robert, who is a Methodist, has small attractions for her compared with the unknown Cornish situation. Thither accordingly she repairs, and finds her relatives not only socially beneath her mother's station and education, but smugglers as well. They are, however, cordial and simple people, and she speedily domesticates herself. Her cousin Adam makes this easier to her by being a man of education and energy and high temper, and by winning her affections. He is in turn beloved by his cousin Joan, a true Cornish girl, racy of the soil, and both the best character of the book and a character of which most novelists might be proud. She deserves a better fate than she meets in the original Robert, who, having come to Cornwall to see how Eve is getting on, betrays the smugglers to the revenue officers, and, after being thus the cause of getting one of them hanged, is so attentive to him during his last hours as to captivate Joan. This is a false note, and seems a mere expedient to dispose of the girl, which any one capable of creating so genuine a person should not have resorted to. Adam, by the way, is the direct cause of his adopted brother's death; he gets absurdly jealous and denounces him to the authorities, and after all the fat is in the fire is properly dejected, which does not prevent him from marrying Eve and going off to America. In fact the book goes to pieces lamentably at the end, and is sufficiently tedious at the outset, but the Cornish interiors and the entire life at Polperro are exceedingly well done.

Mr. Hardy has become a voluminous writer of fiction without attracting that attention or earning that fame which his merits seemed at one time likely to procure for him. He has never risen much above nor sunk much below the level of his 'Under the Greenwood Tree.' In all his succeeding novels we have had the same delicacy of observation, the same curious combination of felicity with infelicity of expression, the same success in getting what may roughly be called tone, without much faithfulness in other equally important matters. 'The Trumpet-Major' is a story of English life at the time of the threatened invasion by Napoleon. The scene is laid in a village near the Wessex coast. The characters are: Mrs. Martha Garland, a landscape-painter's widow; Loveday, a miller; Anne Garland, the landscape-painter's daughter; the two sons of the miller, John Loveday, a trumpet-major, and Robert Loveday, a mate in the merchant service, and afterward a naval officer under Nelson; Matilda Johnson, a theatrical lady of doubtful character, engaged at one time to Bob Loveday; old Derriman, a miser, who makes Anne his heir; and Festus Derriman, a coward and bully, who torments Anne with offers of marriage. The story is of the very simplest description. John Loveday falls in love with Anne, but gives her up to his brother, whom Anne has always loved, but who has by no means always loved her. Festus is disappointed and marries Matilda Johnson, the miller marries Anne's mother, and Anne of course marries Bob. There is an alarm on the occasion of a reported landing of Napoleon's fleet; there is the descent of a press-gang upon the Loveday mill and its inmates; but even these stirring events are told in the quiet manner which Mr. Hardy knows so

'Kate Comerford; or, Sketches of Garrison Life. By Teresa A. Thornt.' Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1881.
'As Thyself. By Sue W. Hubbard.' Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1881.
'The Head of Medusa. By George Fleming.' Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1880.

'Adam and Eve. By the author of 'Dorothy Fox.' Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1881.
'The Trumpet-Major: A Novel. By Thomas Hardy.' (Leisure-Hour Series.) New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1880.

well how to employ, and for the rest the book is composed of little but description and dialogue of the most everyday character. In this dialogue the author is at a disadvantage from his apparent inability to reproduce bygone fashions of conversation. Certainly no people in England, at the time all England was arming to the teeth to resist the projected invasion of Napoleon, talked or expressed their thoughts in the way the people in this book do. No people could talk so who were not thoroughly familiar with the verse and prose of the nineteenth century, and there was not yet time for this at the period of the story. Festus Derriman's oaths and braggadocio have a somewhat antique flavor, but even Festus's language is a jumble of old and new. Notwithstanding these defects the book has the charm of all Mr. Hardy's novels, in presenting a pleasing picture. The characters may be artificially drawn, but they stand out in distinct relief from the canvas. Their grouping is pleasing to the eye, their action natural. The puzzle is how any writer with the delicacy of perception and touch possessed by Mr. Hardy can in detail betray so much want of perception. It is impossible to avoid coming to the conclusion that a great deal of this unevenness in Mr. Hardy's style comes from carelessness; but whatever the cause, the result is a jar almost like that produced by discords in music. There is, by the way, a constant suggestion both of pictorial and musical picture in Mr. Hardy's writing; his descriptions bring things vividly before the eye, while at the same time he is fond of making the last note of expression vibrate for the ear. The result is a style peculiar to the point of eccentricity—a style at times natural to flatness, and again artificial to a degree that can only be characterized as affectation. Whether such novels are liked or not must depend a good deal upon individual taste. There is much in them to please an educated taste, just as there is much in them to repel the ordinary reader.

In reviewing, some time since, the 'Wreck of the *Grosvenor*,' in these columns, we expressed the opinion that the book must have been written by a thorough seaman. Mr. Russell now says in his preface that the very last misgiving he had was that the accuracy of the story would be questioned, and adds that he has passed eight years of his life at sea in the merchant service, and therefore thinks that his critics should admit the probability that he knows what he is writing about. He vouches for the truth of all the incidents related in the 'Wreck of the *Grosvenor*,' and assures us that there is nothing in 'A Sailor's Sweetheart' that is not equally true. We are perfectly willing to take his word for it, for, startling as many of the events are, the most noticeable thing about both the books is the accent of truth which pervades them. The difference between the two novels is still very great. We cannot imagine 'A Sailor's Sweetheart' ever exciting the interest which the author's first story did, and this mainly for reasons which have nothing to do with the accuracy or probability of the narrative. The really remarkable thing about the first story was the manner in which the interest was sustained from the first to the last. It was a connected, coherent, and complete tale of peril and adventure at sea, and for ourselves we confess to having found it impossible to lay the book down after having once taken it up. This literary excellence was so strongly marked that we were misled into supposing that the author had entirely concealed himself behind the character who was made the narrator, and that he must be as accomplished a writer as he evidently was a seaman. 'A Sailor's Sweetheart,' however, shows that this is not the case, but that Mr. Russell has very much to learn in the art of novel-writing. The interest is not sustained at all. There are plenty of startling and sensational incidents, the madness of Captain Flanders is graphically described, and the incident of the water-logged brig has all of the vividness of reality, but the story as a story does not possess a continuous interest. And, besides this, Mr. Russell has apparently made the mistake of imagining that his forte is that of a writer of love-stories. This was the one weakness betrayed in the 'Wreck of the *Grosvenor*,' and this weakness is exaggerated to a sickening point in 'A Sailor's Sweetheart.' Helen Williams is a most admirable woman and made of the right stuff for a sailor's wife, but there is a great deal too much of her. With all its drawbacks, however, 'A Sailor's Sweetheart' will be found a good story, and we confidently recommend it to the nautical critic of one of our esteemed contemporaries who devoted a good deal of valuable time a year or two ago to showing that the author of the 'Wreck of the *Grosvenor*' knew nothing about the navigation of ships.

While there is a strong family resemblance between all the stories of Jules Verne, there is an immense variety in his plots. This is partly owing to the fact that he draws upon all the stores of modern science, supplemented and corrected by a peculiarly vivid imagination. In his last novel the scene is laid in China, and the adventures are those of a Chinese gentleman, Kin-Fo by name. Kin-Fo is young, wealthy, and engaged to the beautiful La-Oo. He has, however, never had a great misfortune, and, consequently, has never known the full meaning of life. This vital psychological defect is made known to him by Wang, a philosopher, through whom Kin-Fo is in the end to learn the secret of the great riddle. At the opening of the story he learns that the

Central Bank of California, in which all his property is invested, has failed, and he is consequently almost a beggar. Proceeding to the office of the Centenarian Fire and Life Insurance Company with his remaining loose cash, he purchases a policy in this company for \$200,000, the risk covering suicide, which he very frankly informs the company he proposes to commit. Securing \$50,000 to the philosopher Wang, and \$150,000 to La-Oo, Kin-Fo prepares for death, determining, however, to die in such a way as to procure for himself the utmost emotion possible. He therefore explains to his friend Wang the situation of affairs, and begs that philosopher to kill him without any previous warning. This commission Wang undertakes, but shortly afterward disappears. At the same time the news comes that the Central Bank has not failed, and Kin-Fo now desires to live as much as he had formerly desired to die. The insurance company has been from the first anxious to preserve his life, and has deputed two spies to watch over and preserve him at all hazards in the interest of the corporation. Great publicity is given to the matter, Kin-Fo becomes a noted character, and, accompanied by the two spies, starts out on a voyage of discovery after Wang. In the end Kin-Fo, after incredible adventures, finds Wang, his life is saved, he marries La-Oo, and everything ends happily. The author has introduced into his story the Boyton life-saving suit and the phonograph, which appears as a customary means of correspondence in China. There is no limit to Jules Verne's audacity, and his popularity shows how little people care for scientific accuracy in fiction. The French have always been famous for their ignorance of foreign countries, and at one time were noted for their indifference to reality in romance; but Jules Verne's audience is quite as much English and American as French, and the secret of his popularity with Anglo-Saxon readers is, we fancy, simply to be found in their universal love of stories of adventure.

The Power of Movement in Plants. By Charles Darwin, LL.D., F.R.S., assisted by Francis Darwin. With illustrations. (London: John Murray, 1880.)—Let no one be misled by his memory of the great run of 'The Origin of Species' and 'The Descent of Man' into the supposition that the present volume is a book for popular reading and dinner-table discussion. It is interesting and curious in its way, but it is a strictly scientific treatise, the record of a vast number of experiments contrived with characteristic ingenuity for eliciting decisive answers to critical questions—experiments conducted with immense patience, and described in this volume with a particularity and iteration which may well be tiresome to the non-professional reader. Let such, however, give their attention to the introduction and the summaries, and they will find that the seemingly simple and dull annals of plant-life, when explored by a master, abound in curious and moving incidents, many of them till now unnoticed. They will learn that most simple structures suffice for varied, complex, and wondrous actions; that the tiny root of a seedling, in addition to what was thought to be its only and passive instinct for growing downward, exhibits at least three different and independent kinds of movement: that the initial stemlet rising out of the ground continually circumnutates—to use Darwin's well-chosen word; that, besides this general bowing of stem in all directions, there is a special bending, in most cases toward the light (heliotropism), in some away from it; while, again, certain stems and most roots respond in a mysterious way to the influence of gravitation and turn earthward (geotropism); that almost all leaves, even seed-leaves, circumnutate, at least when young, and some keep up their gyratory exercises quite to old age; that shoot and leaf-stalk and the stalk of leaflet move independently, either in conjunction or otherwise; that the changes of position correlated with day and night—as in what is called the sleep of plants and their waking—and both the movements and the special sensitiveness exhibited by climbing plants (so ably investigated by Mr. Darwin in a former volume) are only specialized modifications and more extensive, or at least more conspicuous, exhibitions of faculties which every seedling is now known to manifest.

"If we look, for instance, at a great acacia-tree, we may feel assured that every one of the innumerable growing shoots is constantly describing small ellipses, as is each petiole, subpetiole, and leaflet. . . . If we could but look beneath the ground, and our eyes had the power of a microscope, we should see the tip of each rootlet endeavoring to sweep small ellipses or circles, as far as the pressure of the surrounding earth permitted. All this astonishing amount of movement has been going on year after year since the time when, as a seedling, the tree first emerged from the ground."

Indeed, the root-tip of a seedling—quite out of all ordinary expectation or surmise—is most richly endowed with faculties of a sort which were until recently held to be exclusively animal. Our author says:

"We believe that there is no structure in plants more wonderful, as far as its functions are concerned, than the tip of the radicle. If the tip be lightly pressed or burnt or cut, it transmits an influence to the upper adjoining part, causing it to bend away from the affected side; and, what is still more surprising, the tip can distinguish between a slightly harder and a softer object by which it is simultaneously pressed on opposite sides. If, however, the radi-

'A Sailor's Sweetheart: An Account of the Wreck of the Sailing-ship *Waldershare*. From the Narrative of Mr. William Lee, Second Mate. By W. Clark Russell.' New York: Harper & Bros.
'The Tribulations of a Chinaman. By Jules Verne. Translated by Ellen E. Frewer. Illustrated by L. Bennett.' New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1881.

cle is pressed by a similar object a little above the tip, the pressed part does not transmit any influence to the more distant parts, but bends abruptly towards the object. If the tip perceives the air to be moister on one side than on the other, it likewise transmits an influence to the upper adjoining part, which bends toward the source of moisture. When the tip is excited by light . . . the adjoining part bends from the light; but when excited by gravitation the same part bends towards the centre of gravity."

Add to these movements the circumnutation of rootlets (which Darwin elaborately demonstrates and describes, and by which the growing tip turns or presses to all sides in succession), and, after reading the summary account of the part which these various movements play in the economy of the plant (when as a seedling it is subjected to perhaps its most severe struggle for life and needs the most prompt and perfect possible adaptation to its conditions), consider that "the course pursued by the radicle must be determined by the tip," and we shall perhaps be led to agree with the author in his suggestion of what at first would seem to be the most fanciful analogy—viz., "that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the tip of the radicle, thus endowed and having the power of directing the movements of the adjoining parts, acts like the brain of one of the lower animals." Here let us note a characteristic difference between Mr. Darwin's views and conclusions and those of the modern school of vegetable physiologists, of which Sachs is the leader. This school is disposed to attribute all such actions as are manifested in obedience to gravitation, light, etc., as direct mechanical consequences of these agencies. Mr. Darwin concludes—we suppose more wisely—"that light, or the alternations of light and darkness, gravitation, etc., . . . do not directly cause the movement; they merely lead to a temporary increase or diminution of those spontaneous changes in the turgescence of the cells which are already in progress." And, more pointedly: "Gravity does not appear to act in a more direct manner on a radicle than it does on any lowly organized animal, which moves away when it feels some weight or pressure." Darwinism is nothing if not teleological; and our author shows that "in almost every case [even in the nyctotropic, or so-called sleeping, state of leaves] we can clearly perceive the final purpose or advantage of the several movements." We cannot tarry to point them out.

The bearing of the investigations here published upon Mr. Darwin's general thesis is not remote, although in this record of experimental work it is nowhere insisted on. Here, at least, there is nothing to alarm the most sensitive religious prejudices. As the *odium theologicum* has been declared to be inversely as the distance between respective creeds, so the jealous dislike which some bear to the doctrine of the derivation of man from inferior animals may be extreme, while conversely the ever-increasing approximation of the vegetable to the animal nature will be viewed with the utmost composure. Let us, in conclusion, welcome the appearance of the second name upon the title-page of the present volume, and congratulate the father that his labors are shared and lightened, and his researches ably supplemented by the son, who is moreover proving his worthiness for this honor by his independently published investigations.

A Manual of Classical Literature, comprising biographical notices of the principal Greek and Roman authors, with illustrative facts from their works; also, a brief survey of the rise and progress of literature, with descriptions of the minor authors. By Morris. (Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1880. 12mo, pp. 418.)—an easy thing to compose a history of literature for schools which the student at once to appreciate and enjoy the several authors to understand through them the intellectual life of the nation to which they belong.

Talking about authors, and giving elaborate criticisms of them and their works, amounts to very little until the student has already some familiarity with them. Any such study, to be profitable, must be at *first hand*, must be directed primarily to the authors themselves. The text-book can afford little more than a sketch of their lives and principal works; and the more personal this is, the more abounding in characteristic incident, the better it will accomplish the end in view. The thing to be done is to study the authors themselves; but it is notorious how unsatisfactory "elegant extracts" are as illustrations of authors. They are like the brick which "Scholasticos" carried about as a specimen of his house. And if they are very unsatisfactory in one's native literature (we do not say they are not indispensable, and at any rate better than nothing, or than mere talk about the authors), how much more when they are strained through the medium of a foreign tongue, as must be the case in the history of any foreign literature. The student does not know whether he is reading Homer or Pope. In any case the rule should be to talk as little as possible about the authors, but to let them speak for themselves. Here is Mr. Morris's principal fault; his introductions are too long and discursive. There is too much of such generalizing as: "Thought dawns upon mankind in the form of imaginative wonders and terrors" (p. 27). Perhaps it does; but this is too far away from the concrete literature of the Greeks and Romans to warrant introducing it into so compendious a treatise as this.

Apart from this the book is on the whole well done. The remarks, when to the point, are judicious, the selections made with judgment, and generally in good translations. It is a mistake not to note just where the original is to be found; often the student would like to compare it with the original, and for this he has no clue whatever. We wish the editor had followed the example he himself set, in giving Emerson's golden words about Plato (p. 165), and had given many such brief criticisms from modern literature; it would be a unique and very helpful thing. Perhaps the best portion of his own work is the sketches of the tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles; he has told the story very well, but has neglected to point out clearly the passage from one play to another. Seeing that we have (p. 199) such unimportant details as the names of the Alexandrine "Pleiades," it is surprising that we have not the list of the Athenian orators—no mention even of Hyperides and Lycurgus. The early Roman orators, too, are very inadequately treated. The treatise *De Oratoribus* is said (p. 387) to be "probably a production of Quintilian's"; surely Mr. Morris should know that the present opinion among scholars is strongly in favor of its Tacitean authorship: let him, for example, consult Prof. Peck's paper upon the subject in the last volume of the 'Transactions of the American Philological Association.' He ought to know, too (p. 390), that Tacitus' name is now generally admitted to have been Publius, not Caius (he always spells this name with a C). Of misprints we note *Decius* for *Decimus* (p. 280); *Herodum* for *Herodum* (p. 305); *Dendatus* for *Dentatus* (p. 351); *Pactus* for *Pactus* (p. 374).

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Almanach de Gotha, 1881.	(B. Westermann & Co.)
Carter (A. G. W.), The Old Court-House.	(Peter G. Thomson) \$3 50
Curtis (B. R.), Jurisdiction, Practice, and Peculiar Jurisprudence of the U. S. Courts.	(Little, Brown & Co.)
Grove (G.), Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Part xii, swd.	(Macmillan & Co.) 1 00
Hayard (H.), La Hollande.	(J. W. Bouton)
Hayes (A. A., jr.), New Colorado and the Santa Fe Trail.	(Harper & Bros.)
Jeffrey (Rose V.), The Crimson Hand, and Other Poems.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Joan the Maid.	(Bodd, Mead & Co.)
Linton (Mrs. E. Lynn), The Rebel of the Family, swd.	(Harper & Bros.) 20
Littell's Living Age, Vol. 17.	(Littell & Co.)
Magazine of American History, Vols. iv, v.	(A. S. Barnes & Co.)
Phillimore (Catherine M.), Fra Angelico.	(Scribner & Welford)
Scott (L.), Fra Bartolommeo.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Wayside Flowers: Poetry.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

*The Young Folks' Cyclopædia*OF
PERSONS & PLACES.

By John D. Champlin, Jr. 8vo, illustrated, 936 pp., \$3 50.

The Trumpet Major.

By Thomas Hardy. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

A Dreamer.

By Katharine Wylde. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

IVORYTYPES, from life or portrait, \$10. It is difficult to believe how perfectly a face can be caught from even an inferior photograph. For this reason I guarantee satisfaction. JANE JOHNSTON. Address, Hamilton and Sixty-first Streets, Philadelphia.

GAS FIXTURES,

Fine Clocks and Bronzes,

PORCELAIN LAMPS,

AND

ORNAMENTAL METAL WORK.

NEWEST AND MOST DESIRABLE STYLES.

Exclusive Designs (if desired), specially adapted to furniture and decoration, unequalled in excellence of style and workmanship.

MITCHELL, VANCE & CO.,

836 and 838 Broadway, New York.

A GENERAL INDEX

TO THE FIRST THIRTY VOLUMES OF
THE NATION

Has been published, and will be sent on receipt of price (\$2 in

paper, \$2 50 in cloth) by

Q. P. INDEX, Bangor, Maine,

or Publisher of the *Nation*, Box 25, New York.

New English Books

At 25 cents to the Shilling,

Sent, post-paid, direct from London, on receipt of price of publication in bankers' draft, currency, or post-office order.

The recent Custom-House and Post-Office Circulars permit all printed matter to be mailed to the United States with safety and economy, and the duty, if any, to be collected from addressees.

Stevens's Priced List of nearly 500 English, French, and German Periodicals, with fuller Announcement for supplying books by mail or freight, is distributed gratuitously by every public library in the United States, by Rice & Lynch, 34½ Pine Street, New York, and B. F. STEVENS, American Library and Literary Agent, Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, London, England.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD

STEAMSHIP COMPANY,

FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND

BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$80; Second Cabin, \$50. Steerage, \$30. Prepaid

Steerage Certificates, \$20.

For freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,

Bowling Green.

H. J. HEWITT, Printer, 27 Rose St., New York.

